

UCSB LIBRARY

X-18426



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE EXPOSITOR.

VOL. X.

List of Contributors to Volume X.

- REV. PROFESSOR BENJ. W. BACON, D.D., YALE UNIVERSITY.
VERNON BARTLET, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR J. H. BERNARD, D.D.
REV. ARMSTRONG BLACK.
REV. A. A. BURD.
REV. A. E. BURN, M.A.
REV. ARTHUR CARR, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR T. K. CHEYNE, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR MARCUS DODS, D.D.
LATE PROFESSOR HENRY DRUMMOND, F.R.S.E., F.G.S.
REV. PROFESSOR R. A. FALCONER, D.D.
REV. J. MONRO GIBSON, M.A., D.D.
REV. CANON GIRDLESTONE, M.A.
REV. J. R. ILLINGWORTH, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR A. N. JANNARIS, M.A.
C. H. W. JOHNS, M.A.
REV. J. H. KENNEDY, D.D.
REV. H. J. C. KNIGHT, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR JOHN LAIDLAW, D.D.
REV. F. Warburton LEWIS, B.A.
REV. PROFESSOR WALTER LOCK, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR ALLAN MENZIES, D.D.
REV. GEORGE MILLIGAN, M.A.
PROFESSOR W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D.
J. Y. SIMPSON, M.A.
REV. JOHN WATSON, D.D.
REV. NEWPORT J. D. WHITE, B.D.

THE
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

FIFTH SERIES.

Volume X.

London :

HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCXCIX.

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.

THE DOCTRINES OF GRACE.

V.

THE VICARIOUS SACRIFICE OF JESUS CHRIST.

WHEN Caiaphas, the titular Jewish High Priest and the agent of a much more crafty man, the actual High Priest Annas, laid down this principle in the High Council of the nation that it was expedient one man should die for the nation, and used this principle as an argument for the judicial murder of Jesus Christ, Caiaphas afforded a remarkable illustration of how one may mean what is utterly false and may at the same time say what is profoundly true. Caiaphas in this utterance was defending the most wicked act in all human history, and he was declaring one of the most precious truths in all human experience. What he meant was that it would be a good stroke of policy to silence Jesus for ever, because Jesus was teaching unwelcome truths, and might deliver His fellow-countrymen from the yoke of the Temple exactions. What really happened as the result of his action was that Jesus overcame the power of sin upon the Cross of Calvary and achieved the spiritual deliverance of the human race. Many good things, as, for instance, the English Reformation, have sprung from the basest of motives, and one has ever carefully to distinguish between the malign scheme of the Jewish ruler, which is ever to be reprobated, and its splendid results in the redemption of Jesus Christ. For in this case also God made light to spring out of darkness, and where sin abounded grace has much more abounded.

It indeed has come to pass in this event that where sin reached its most shameless and victorious height the Grace of God accomplished His most benevolent and fruitful purpose.

Certainly it was not expedient that Christ should die in the sense that Caiaphas intended, for whatever we may think of vicarious sacrifice, we must hold fast by the principle that for a judge to send an innocent man to death is a most unjust thing and can never be excused, and also by the principle that nothing which is unjust can ever be expedient or can be justified by its results. When the Pharisees formed a dishonourable alliance with the priests, and the priests corrupted Judas Iscariot, and the priests and the Pharisees together accomplished the death of Jesus Christ, they committed the basest crime and they earned a most deserved condemnation. The crucifixion of Jesus through the plotting of these men was a colossal outrage upon the laws of their own State and upon the traditions of the nation. It ended, as by a natural consequence, in the historical and indescribable punishment of the destruction of Jerusalem. Should it happen, as it sometimes does in human life, that a crime produces good fruit, that blessing will be shared by many, but the perpetrator of the crime will only have the punishment; and so it has come to pass that the world goes on a pilgrimage to the Cross of Jesus and returns with the gift of everlasting life, but the names of the men who caused that Cross to be erected, and, using Roman hands, caused Christ to be nailed thereon, shall be a byword and a reproach unto all generations.

While this is true, and must ever be kept in mind, might it not be expedient that an innocent man, against whom no charge of sin could be proven and whose goodness deserved only the highest reward, should take his own life in his hands and lay it down of his own accord on behalf of the

people? Had the priests and Pharisees been candid and honourable men, they would have heard Christ gladly, and would have treated Him with all honour, so that He never should have known want, and they would have shielded Him from the shadow of insult, so that He would have had authority in the land. Suppose, however, that Jesus did not wish to guard Himself from suffering, and to live at ease, but was willing to be betrayed and outraged and crucified in devotion to the will of God and for the good of His fellow-men, is not this an altogether beautiful thing? and if the human race on their part, realizing the immense victory of the Cross of Jesus Christ, and feeling their constant need of Him, be willing throughout all the ages to take the gift which He has won by His Passion and by His Death, may not this also be expedient and just? This question appeals both to the intellect and to the conscience, and upon the answer depends whether we can accept the doctrine of Jesus' vicarious sacrifice.

The question has the greater weight because no one can estimate the nature and force of Christianity without discovering that in the last issue all its benefits have been won as it were at the point of the Cross and that all it offers springs from the Fountain of Calvary. When St. Paul summed up the energy of Christianity in the Cross of Christ, he not only used a very felicitous image, which will ever cling to the memory and ever inspire the heart, but he also went to the root of things, and he stated the inwardness of our religion. What is true of Christ is also true of Christ's Cross, that it is the living Way by which the human soul passes into the fellowship of the Father. It stands out in religious experience on the border between light and darkness like the frontier post between Canada and the United States in former days, so that when the fugitive slave passed this point he became a freed man and no one could afterwards enslave him. It is at the

Cross that the terror of guilt and the shackles of moral bondage fall from off a man's soul and he enters into the liberty of the sons of God, a man whose sin is forgiven and whose iniquity is cleansed. Is not the Cross also the source of all heavenly thoughts, of all spiritual reinforcements, of all gracious aspirations? By the contact of this Cross, as we are made its partakers in daily life, we are raised above the things of sense and enter into the fulness of life. Just in proportion as the disciple is crucified in that proportion is he a Christian, and just as he takes his standpoint by the Cross has he a true understanding of the life which now is, and of that which is to come. As one considers the chief doctrines of our faith, regeneration, justification, and sanctification, he must see them hanging as fruits upon the bitter tree of the Cross, which was no sooner planted than it began to grow and to bud, so that its leaf has never faded and its fruit has never failed.

Some people, however, are face to face with a certain ethical difficulty and cannot in honesty pass on without its settlement—whether in truth, if you go into the heart of the matter, this vicarious sacrifice was not unjust, and whether it is possible that any person can be saved from sin in an unjust way. This difficulty resolves itself into two questions, and the first is this: Is it right that one who has made great sacrifices should not enjoy his just reward, and one who has made none should be endowed with that reward?

Granted, it may be said, that it was an altogether becoming thing that Jesus should sacrifice Himself, and granted that immense benefit has come to the race from His death, is this sacrifice founded on any principle of justice, and had the race any right to the benefit it has grasped? When a person asks this question, it is evident that he has a certain idea of the conditions of human life, which is in the background of his mind, and to which he

is accustomed to refer. He thinks of each person as a separate unit, beginning life on his own account, living on his own account, dying on his own account. He imagines that every man stands in his own place, and that his destiny is absolutely independent of his nearest neighbour. If the man mixes a bitter cup, that cup must he drink; if it be a sweet cup, that cup shall be his. None can exchange the cup, bitter or sweet, with another man. What we sow in the springtime we must reap in the days of harvest, and there is no power of interference anywhere so that the man who sowed tares shall receive wheat any more than the man that sowed wheat shall be cursed with tares. Unto every man his due, is surely the principle of Eternal Law; and if that be the case, how can any man stand in Christ's place, or Christ stand in any man's place.

Regarding this idea of life it seems perfectly fair that it you have made your bed you must lie on it, and if you have sown the wind you must reap the whirlwind. One may admit that it not only seems right but that it is logically right, and that life ought theoretically to be constructed on this individualistic principle. Every person, however, is aware how little the logic of the schools has to do with the practical rules of life, and one is bound to enquire whether as a matter of fact life really does rest upon the independence of the individual. Perhaps it may in the planet of Mars, but it certainly does not in this world. We have no experience of this absolute individualism, this separation of one man's destiny from another, this rigid recompense whereby every one receives exactly what he has earned and nothing which he has not earned. What we do see is men, women and children so inextricably linked together that one man falling carries down twenty with him, and one man standing fast in his integrity bears the strain of twenty other lives. What we realize in our day is not individualism, but rather collectivism, which means that the race is not

made up of an innumerable number of single lives which have no connection one with another, but that the race is a huge body with common feelings both of joy and sorrow, so that if one member be injured, all the other members shall suffer; and if one member be strong, all the others shall share in the strength.

When an intelligent person takes an intellectual or ethical objection to vicarious sacrifice, one would imagine that this principle were a pure monopoly of theological speculation, and that he had never seen it acted in his own life. Has this man owed nothing to the services and to the sacrifices of others who have gone before him and whom perhaps he has never known? Was he not brought into being at the grave peril and with the bitter anguish of his mother? May he not have been a sickly child, of whom people said that he could never be reared nor reach the estate of manhood, and he has been reared and has come to be a man through the sleepless nights and weary days of his mother, through her loss of pleasure and sacrifice of ease? Is he not then a fruit of vicarious sacrifice in one of its purest and most pathetic forms? This man also is the citizen of a nation, and has a share in the government of its affairs, but he is aware that there was a day when his ancestors had no voice in government and were only bondsmen in their own land, at the mercy of every tyrant, political and ecclesiastical. How does it come to pass that this man has not only freedom of conscience but also freedom of action? Has he won his just rights by his own exertions and by his own suffering? Is it not the case that men to whom God gave the spirit of patriotism long ago were willing to sacrifice their goods and even their lives for blessings which they did not enjoy themselves and which, except with the eye of prophecy, they could not see? These blessings were bought with their blood and they are enjoyed by their children, and none of us objects

that this gain of ours is an evidence of injustice. How does it come to pass that one lad begins life in abject poverty and in moral misery while another has the advantage of good education and a careful training? That one starts as it were with accumulated capital of goodness and the other starts hopelessly bankrupt? Certainly the one has no blame, and certainly the other has no credit. Before each lad lived his father, the father of one lad a careless and selfish man, gratifying his own pleasures and his own sins, the other a hardworking and severe-living man, thinking not of himself but of his children, and willing to suffer if so be that they enjoy. They have enjoyed, and now this lad's successful career is an illustration and a vindication of vicarious sacrifice. Is it not right that a man should suffer for others, and do we not admire his suffering? Is it not allowable that another should receive the benefit of that sacrifice, and are we not all with perfect satisfaction of conscience debtors on the ordinary plane of life through vicarious sacrifice?

Some years ago, to condense the whole argument in a single illustration, a merchant vessel went out from a port on the western coast and was driven upon the rocks in one of the great storms. Boats could not live in such a sea, and it was a question whether any man could swim through the surf to the shore. One after another each man of the crew put on his life belt and jumped overboard till at last the captain only remained upon the deck of the vessel. No men in our commonwealth are more loyal to their duty, or discharge their duty in a more unassuming way, than the captains of our merchant service. They are men who are willing to sacrifice everything, even unto their life, in fulfilment of their charge, who have learnt the meaning of courage in a hard school. This man had already put on his belt and was about to make his fight for life, when out of the vessel somewhere there crept a poor lad and stood

beside him. He was simply a street arab who had stowed himself away in the vessel, and now, under pressure of danger and in terror of life, had come upon the deck a miserable, helpless, shivering atom of human life. The captain looked at him and looked at the surf, and there was not another life belt. The captain had either to give him his belt and most likely be drowned, or save his own life and leave the lad to perish. This brave man put his life belt on the lad and sent him overboard, so that the lad reached the shore while the captain himself perished in the waves. One of course may say that it had been better to let the boy perish, for what was he worth to the commonwealth, or even to himself? Would it not also have been a gain if the captain's life had been saved, for he was worth much to his family and to the State? It is, however, impossible to criticise such conduct. Our hands are not steady enough to hold the scales before such magnificent heroism. Whatever one may think of vicarious sacrifice, of its expediency or of its justice, there is no man who would not give the crown to the memory of such a gallant seaman. It is therefore perfectly clear, when one closes the Bible and turns from the life of Christ, that one does not go outside the law of vicarious sacrifice, but that in great straits of life a man still stands in the stead of his neighbour, so that he endures for him, and even dies for him, while he for whom he dies is endowed with great privileges and inestimable gifts. This is the law which runs through human life, which can be verified in every street of every city, and in every home where there is any nobility of thought.

Is not this also a beautiful law which endears unto us all the person who has obeyed it, and gives him his due reward of affection? Consider, for instance, the Divine Person who made Himself the Victim, and so wrought salvation for His race. He accepted the scourge and the nails, He

humbled Himself and became obedient unto the Cross, and now He has been highly exalted and had obtained unto Himself a Name which is above every name. Without the Cross there had been no Son of God within our knowledge, and no Son of Man within our heart; there had been no Head of the Church without the Cross. Jesus had been without His praise and without His power had He not been crucified upon Calvary. No injustice, therefore, has been done to Him who suffered our disabilities; no injustice to them who have received His benefits. No message is so swift and certain as Love; no Love has been so strong as that which has on it the imprint of the wounded hands and feet. No example is so inspiring as that of selflessness; none so quick to make us brave and pure. The greatest regenerative power in the world is love, and it was love which made Christ surrender His heavenly glory and lay down His life for the world.

It is, however, impossible to shut one's eyes to the fact that at one point the sacrifice of Christ has no illustration in human life, and, indeed, could not have any. A second question, therefore, arises. Can one who has sinned be counted righteous because one who has not sinned accepted his penalty? Jesus was without question a martyr in His devotion to the will of God and to the welfare of man, and from His martyrdom have flowed constant and inestimable blessings. We have learned the love of God, and the glory of humanity, the type of the perfect life and the unspeakable degradation of sin. We have received the example of high living and the inspiration of a great leader. Such good things have come to us through Jesus' sacrifice as on lower levels of life great benefits have come to us through political and social martyrs. No martyr, however, has ever suffered literally in another's stead, so that he took the place of the person for whom he suffered and the person for whom he suffered stepped into his place. No one in

human experience has taken upon him the guilt of a brother man, and has expiated that guilt after a legal fashion, so that the innocent was treated as guilty, and the guilty has been treated as innocent. This is the last extreme, and it is also the crown of vicarious sacrifice, and this is the measure of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ.

No person can read Jesus' life and have any doubt of His perfect sinlessness, for He was exposed to the fiercest criticism and was followed at every turn by the most watchful enemies, and yet He was able to give the challenge and ask any one to convict Him of sin. From every side witnesses arose willing and unwilling to bear witness to His innocence, not only men and women who believed in Him and loved Him, but also the traitor who betrayed Him, and the judge who sent Him to His death. Alone of all the sons of men He walked in white unstained and radiant through the miry paths of life, and when He died He died as a just man and as the Son of God.

No person can read His life without also observing that, from the beginning to the end, He was treated as an unjust person would have been, and in the end as the very chief of sinners. The consideration given to the poorest of men was denied to Him, and the justice, both of Jewish and of Roman laws, was broken that He might be condemned. By every scheme of iniquity was His condemnation secured, with every circumstance of cruelty was His death carried out. It is an outstanding fact that the most innocent of all men shared the fate of the most guilty. Jesus did not at any time complain of this transposition of lot, but throughout His whole life accepted it as His calling of God. It was for other men to live, and Jesus constantly insisted upon the glory of life. It was for Himself to die, and the only death about which He spake was His own upon the Cross. His death and the life of His disciples were connected together in His mind, inasmuch as He died that they

might live, and the cross to which He moved was the gateway of life everlasting for the world. The reader of Jesus' life will also notice that His death was invested with a mysterious pain and horror, so that not only was its shadow flung across the three years of His public life, and, it may be, earlier days, but He came to regard the approach of the Cross with sinking of heart. History records the bravery and peace of soul with which the witnesses of Christ have looked forward to the scaffold, so that they slept the night before execution, and anticipated death with a high heart. This man, braver than them all, agonized the night through before His death, so that He cried aloud and sweat great drops of blood. This cannot mean that He had not the faith and resolution of St. Peter or St. Paul; this must mean that His death had in it a shame and an agony which were unknown and never could be known to any of His disciples.

We can in measure understand why Jesus agonized in Gethsemane when we listen to what He said in the Upper Room. As He gave the bread and wine, the symbol of His love and of His death, to His disciples, He declared that His blood was to be shed not simply for their good and in revelation of the divine love, but for the remission of their sin. Because He died their sin would be forgiven, and therefore, before dying, He must have taken upon Him the load of their guilt, and in dying He must have expiated the same, according to the demands of everlasting law and according to the will of God. This Good Shepherd, as He explained, would lay down His life for the sheep. He would give His life as a ransom for many. If, indeed, the sin of the human race gathered in one huge penalty and cloud of guilt upon the head of Jesus Christ, then it is no wonder that He suffered in Gethsemane and besought the Father that the cup should pass from Him, nor that on the Cross, as He realized in His heart the horror of the world's

sin, He should have cried, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?"

This explanation of Jesus' vicarious sacrifice has, of course, raised great difficulties in the mind, and we are accustomed to ask how it is possible that an innocent person should be considered guilty, and a guilty person should be accepted as innocent. And we are constantly insisting that there is no parallel in human life to this transaction, and that such an interchange would never be tolerated in any earthly court of justice. Certainly there is no exact parallel, and human justice must not be administered after this fashion; but there is in human life an approximate parallel which has its own significance, not so much as an argument, but rather as an illustration. Is it not the case that husbands and wives are so closely united that in society the guilt of the man casts its shadow over the woman, and she may suffer in human judgment who herself has done no wrong? Is it not also the case that a son who has done wrong and given great offence to society is pardoned and received on account of the character and services of his father? Not only have we received benefit which we have never earned through the sacrifice of other people, not only have we disabilities which we have not deserved through the weakness of other people, but there are circumstances where the shadow of a crime not his own darkens another man's life, and where the credit of goodness not his own has cleansed the shadow from a sinner's life.

We ought, however, always to remember that it is not only not necessary to show the exact parallel between the conditions of human life and the conditions of Jesus' sacrifice, but that we are rather bound to believe that if we are to enter into the heart of this sacrifice, we must be prepared to find it far transcending the province of human life. And the ground for this expectation

lies in the person of Christ. It is impossible to understand in any degree the sacrifice of Jesus at its deepest without understanding in some degree Himself, for this was not an ordinary man who suffered and died upon the Cross. This man took upon Him not simply the nature of an individual, but the nature of our race. From all ages He was the Archetype of humanity, and in the fulness of time He was revealed as its Head. In Him humanity was gathered up and fulfilled, so that He is related to every man that was ever born, and under Him as a Head all men are gathered. While it is true that He offered Himself a sacrifice for men, it is also true that in Him each member of His body was crucified and died, so that the expiation upon the Cross was the expiation not of a single person, but of the whole humanity in Him who was its Representative and Priest. As the several members of the race are intimately connected, so is the race and Jesus one. What He does for us He does as our Kinsman and Brother.

It has also been urged with much reason that, even although Jesus was willing to sacrifice Himself as many a person would be willing to do under conditions of human justice for a criminal that was loved, it is incredible that the Eternal Judge should ever consent to a transaction so unjust, and far less should give it His approving sanction. Is it not a censure on the Eternal Justice that Jesus should have been treated as the substitute for a guilty race, and should have been allowed to drink its bitter cup? One forgets that his mind is again held in bondage by the conditions and limitations of human life. Who is this Eternal Judge but the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ? Who is this Victim but the Eternal Son of God? It is, therefore, God who judges, and it is, therefore, God who suffers; and if the Judge Himself be willing to expiate the penalty, then surely law could not be more splendidly vindicated, and the high ends of justice more fully gained.

If it be counted a noble thing in a lowly member of the human race to obey the law of sacrifice, is this high achievement to be denied to God Himself? In all this universe is there to be only one person, not only absolved from this highest of laws, but also forbidden its fulfilment, and that person to be God? Is it not more reasonable to suppose that if the Cross had become the condition of ethical perfection in human life, it has also been all along the condition of the perfect holiness of God, so that the sacrifice of God in Jesus Christ His Son is the very crown and glory of the highest law?

It is for every person to settle with himself what he will do with this great sacrifice which has been offered by Jesus, according to the will of God, upon the Cross of Calvary, and with the innumerable benefits which this sacrifice has won. And here we find ourselves again upon the plane of human life. We have the same liberty of choice with regard to the sacrifice of Christ that we have with regard to the sacrifice of patriots. Should it be our pleasure, we can avail ourselves of the liberty and of the right which men of old have won for our commonwealth and carry ourselves as free-born citizens, and accept the responsibility of our high citizenship. Or we can carry ourselves as bondsmen, refusing any share in the government of the country and rendering no service. We can also accept with grateful heart the spiritual blessings which are bestowed by the Cross, claiming the forgiveness of sins, and taking our place as the sons of God. Or we can prefer guilt to righteousness, and remain of our own will in the bondage of sin. Two things are certain, that no man can achieve his own salvation, and that our salvation has been accomplished by Jesus Christ. And still another thing is quite as certain, that by an act of consent any one can place himself within the merit of Jesus' sacrifice and serve himself an heir to its fulness of life. May it not be

the case that our minds are clouded with darkness in this matter, because there is darkness in our hearts? Is it not possible that we are not able to believe in the vicarious sacrifice of Christ and are apt to consider it a thing altogether incredible because we ourselves are not willing to make any sacrifice and are leading utterly selfish lives? Is it not the case that, among women throughout the Christian world, it is the rarest thing to find that any one stumbles at the sacrifice of Christ? and is it not the case that women, whether as mothers or daughters or wives, are daily making sacrifices that men will never make and which they cannot even imagine? A woman enters into the sacrifice of Christ and finds in it the expectation of her heart, since in that sacrifice God is only doing on the larger scale of His Deity what she is doing on the narrower scale of her human love. Should it be the case that any one of us is living in any known selfishness, then it will be utterly impossible for him to believe in the sacrifice of Christ, for his own selfishness will veil his mind and harden his heart. When one has given himself to the service of the Divine will, as did the Apostle of the Gentiles, without reserve, without pride, without regret, then he will pass with St. Paul into the heart of this mystery. It is in moments of self-sacrifice that the heart grows tender and darkness turns into light, and of a sudden we find ourselves beneath the kindly shadow of the Cross of Christ, which for ever stretches its arms over the human race with the benediction of its vicarious sacrifice.

JOHN WATSON.

*A HISTORICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE
TO THE GALATIANS.*

XLII. CAUSE OF THE FIRST GALATIAN VISIT.

It was because of bodily disease, "infirmity of the flesh," that the Apostle had first preached the Gospel to the Galatians. Taking this expression by itself, we see that two explanations of it are possible:

1. When I was in your country, but not intending to preach there, a disease caused me to change my intention and preach to you.

2. When I was not intending to enter your country, but had other plans of work, a disease caused me to change my plans, and thus led to my visiting you and preaching to you.

No third explanation seems open.

1. The first of these explanations has been adopted by all adherents of the North-Galatian theory. It is perhaps not absolutely necessary for them to have recourse to it; but as they have unanimously adopted it, we need not discuss whether the other explanation would not be open to them.

Put in this bare and severely simple form, this explanation seems awkward. It is not at first sight probable that Paul would go across a country without any thought of evangelizing there, unless there were some distinct impediment. He twice crossed, evidently without preaching in it, the land ruled by King Antiochus of Commagene and Cilicia Tracheia. But that was not Roman territory, and was therefore outside of his plans;¹ and, moreover, on both occasions he was passing on to carry out a

¹ As Principal A. Robertson says in *EXPOSITOR*, Jan., 1899, p. 2: "I assume that the evangelization of the Roman world as such was an object consciously before his mind and deliberately planned."

pressing work among his own Churches (*Acts* xv. 36, xvi. 1, xviii. 23). Again, he crossed Asia without preaching in it, but his plan of preaching there had been expressly prohibited by the Spirit (*Acts* xvi. 6).

But, it is said, when he was at Lystra or Iconium, and found that his plan of preaching in Asia was prevented, he formed a new plan of preaching in Bithynia, and, as he was going thither, while crossing North Galatia, he was detained by illness, and to this detention "the Galatians owed their knowledge of Christ."¹

But the road from Iconium to Bithynia never touches North Galatia. It lies in Phrygia as far as Dorylaion, and then enters Bithynia. It is marked out by nature, and by immemorial usage. That is beyond dispute. If Paul formed at Lystra or Iconium the plan of preaching in Bithynia, he would never see North Galatia as he went to his goal.

When this undeniable fact is pointed out, the reply is that Paul was going to eastern Bithynia and Pontus—"the east of Bithynia and of Pontus."²

But our one authority says only Bithynia, and we have no right to add Pontus and to make Paul travel to Pontus, dropping Bithynia out of notice. The obvious meaning of our one authority is that Paul, prevented from his first aim of evangelizing Asia with its great and civilized cities, bethought himself of the nearest country to it—Bithynia, with its great and civilized cities, Nicomedia, Nicæa, Cæsarea, etc. He would never select second-rate remote places in the far corner of the Roman Empire, such as Tion, Sinope, and Amisos. There is no conceivable reason

¹ Lightfoot, p. 22. He, however, holds (as I have always done) that Paul traversed the Galatic region before he touched Asia or learned that he was not to preach there. But other supporters of the North-Galatian theory take the view stated in the above paragraph.

² EXPOSITOR, Dec., 1893, p. 415.

why he should traverse and neglect North Galatia in order to reach unimportant towns like those.

The course of the second missionary journey is quite too extraordinary on this supposition. First, Paul aims at Asia; then he aims at Pontus; then he falls ill on the way, and proceeds to evangelize North Galatia, founding there several Churches—a process which requires long time and much travel. Then he proceeds to carry out his previous intention and goes on towards Pontus; and in doing this he finds himself *κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν*! Whether we translate this “to the border of Mysia” or “opposite Mysia,” the statement is a plain impossibility, for the traveller going from North Galatia into “eastern Bithynia and Pontus” would be going north-east, with his back turned towards Mysia.

But it is needless to proceed, as one might do, in the enumeration of the absurdities in which this hypothesis is involved.

Those who cling to the first explanation must be content to recognise here one of those “gaps” in the narrative of Luke which they so often find. They maintain that the “gaps” are numerous and puzzling, and one more added to the number will not be a serious addition.

2. On the second explanation there must have been some occasion, during Paul’s travels, when he changed his plans of work under compulsion of illness. He twice changed his plans on the second journey—first when he entered Asia, and next when he was approaching Bithynia; but in both cases the reason is distinctly assigned by Luke as the Divine guidance and orders; and we cannot admit, with Lightfoot,¹ that the same action is sometimes attributed to Divine command and sometimes to the pressure of external conditions: none of his examples will bear examination.

¹ On *Gal.*, p. 125.

On the first journey, however, there was an occasion when Paul changed his plans. The scope of that journey, as originally contemplated, embraced the lands which were naturally in closest relation with Syrian Antioch, viz., Cyprus and the Pamphylian coast. So long as these were the scene of work, John was a willing companion. But when Paul and Barnabas resolved to abandon Pamphylia and cross Taurus into the Galatic Province, John left them, and left the work. Luke does not state the motives of either party : he does not explain either why the two Apostles resolved to go to Pisidian Antioch, or why John refused to go. The reasons for his silence we can only conjecture ; but two causes, both of which might be combined in his mind, seem both natural and adequate ; he is little concerned with personal details, and he did not desire to dwell on an occasion when John had played a part which he probably afterwards regretted, and which deeply wounded Paul.

With regard to the situation, we may regard the following three statements as highly probable :

(1) There was no express Divine command, for we can hardly believe that John would have disobeyed it ; and, if he had disobeyed such a command, Barnabas would not afterwards have insisted that John was a useful companion and minister for a similar journey (*Acts* xv. 37).

(2) John considered the move into the Galatic Province as a change of plan, and justified his refusal by this plea. He was willing to go to Pamphylia, but not across the mountains ; the former sphere of work had been contemplated from the first, the latter had not.

(3) The cause that made Paul and Barnabas change their original plan must have appeared to them strong and compelling. It was not simply that they began to think the north side of Taurus likely to be a better field than the south ; they had been sent forth by the Spirit, and given

leave of absence by the Church, with an eye to a distinct sphere of work, and their own calculation of probable advantage would not have seemed to them a sufficient reason for changing the sphere.

It was not that Pamphylia was found to be a hopeless district, for when they returned they preached there.

There must, then, have been some reason which made work in Pamphylia impossible at the time, but which afterwards, on their return, was not operative.

Thus we see what were the actual facts. They changed their plan, and they entered the Galatic Province; but the reason was not simple desire to evangelize there, it was some other compelling motive. Here the Epistle clears away all doubt. In it Paul clearly intimates, as his words must be interpreted, that his first visit had been caused not by a desire to preach to the Galatians, but by bodily disease. This cause satisfies all the conditions.

Thus, the way in which these two accounts mutually supplement and explain one another is a most conclusive proof of the honesty and direct simplicity of both.

Other points, as, for example, that Paul's circumstances in Pamphylia were such as to bring out any inherent weakness in his body, do not directly arise out of the Epistle, and have been sufficiently treated elsewhere.¹

XLIII. THE THORN IN THE FLESH.

From the Epistle we can gather something as to the nature of the disease. Lightfoot's discussion of the subject is excellent (*Gal.* p. 186 ff.), and we adopt his conclusions, except his final opinion that the disease was epilepsy, and his suggestion that "the meanness of his personal appearance (2 *Cor.* x. 10) was perhaps due to" the permanent effects of his painful malady.

¹ *Church in Rom. Emp.*, p. 63; *St. Paul the Trav.*, p. 93 ff.

First, the disease was active during Paul's residence in Galatia, and yet it was quite compatible with long journeys. That is implied alike on the North and the South Galatian theories. The disease was active, because the Galatians saw it and did not despise the sufferer; it is implied that the Galatian Churches in general, and not some single one alone, witnessed the Apostle's condition. Yet he was able to make long journeys; on the North-Galatian theory he went about between Ancyra, Tavium, and Pessinus, then proceeded towards Bithynia (or, as some say, Pontus), then went through Mysia to Troas; and all these journeys must have been made very quickly, for no chronological system leaves free a long period for this work. On the South-Galatian theory Paul went from Perga to Syrian Antioch, and then to Iconium, etc. These journeys need not be supposed to have been performed with the speed and exertion implied in the North-Galatian theory, but still they involve much work, and one is very long.

It follows that the disease did not take the form of one single attack of illness. It was intermittent. At one time Paul was prostrated by an attack, at another he was able for considerable exertion, both in travel and in preaching.

Second, the disease was such as to be naturally regarded by the people of Asia Minor with contempt or loathing; but, far from so regarding him, they received him as an angel of God. The verbal contrast is so pointed as to suggest that the disease was one which the people ordinarily regarded as due to the direct action and curse of God. We need not understand that it caused any loathsome external effect; but a sufferer was usually regarded as one under the Divine curse on account of some crime.

Now, the inscriptions show that one disease was regarded in Asia Minor as due to the immediate action of God. These show that, when a native of the country

prayed to the god or the goddess to avenge him on his enemy, he asked that his enemy should be "burnt up" with fever, "in which strength wastes away without any visible affection of a part of the body. This kind of disease was understood to be caused by fire sent from the world of death by direct act of the god, which consumed the inner life and spirit of the sufferer."¹ A full description of an attack of fever, with its recurring paroxysms and characteristic symptoms, is given in a late curse: "may he suffer fevers, chill, torments, pallors, sweatings, heats by day and by night."²

Every one who is familiar with the effect of the fevers that infest especially the south coasts of Asia Minor, but are found everywhere in the country, knows that they come in recurring attacks, which prostrate the sufferer for the time, and then, after exhausting themselves, pass off, leaving him very weak; that a common remedy familiar to all is change to the higher lands; and that, whenever any one who has once suffered has his strength severely taxed, physically or mentally, the old enemy prostrates him afresh, and makes him for a time incapable of work. Apart from the weakness, one of the most trying accompaniments is severe headache, like a hot bar thrust through the head, the "stake in the flesh."

Now, the tradition about Paul was, for some reason, far more closely concerned with his personal appearance and physical history than was the case with any other Apostle. This must undoubtedly be due to the immense personal influence that he exerted on Asia Minor, where the tradition had best chance of being preserved owing to the very early general adoption of the new religion in

¹ See *Expository Times*, Dec., 1898, p. 110; comp. Wunsch in *Corp. Inscr. Att.*, Appendix, p. xii.

² Wunsch, *Sethianische Verfluchungstafeln*, 1898, p. 7. These were found in Rome; but embody magic of indubitably oriental type and origin.

several parts of the country.¹ His personal appearance, his age at conversion and at death, are recorded in Asia Minor tradition, and, as I believe, with trustworthiness. The common opinion, current as early as the second century, was that the extreme physical pain, which he describes elsewhere as "the stake in the flesh," the accompaniment of his disease, was severe headache. Lightfoot rightly recognises that, if we give any weight at all to ancient opinion, we must follow this statement, which was ordinarily accepted in the second century, and which may confidently be taken as forming part of the Asia Minor tradition, continuously preserved from his own time, like the minute description of his face and figure.

When Paul was among the Galatians, this disease was "the thing that tried them in his body"; it tested the reality of their love for him and their respect for him: it constituted a temptation to regard him as a person cursed by God. But they stood the test; they resisted the temptation; and they regarded him as a messenger come from God.

XLIV. THE ALLEGORY OF HAGAR AND SARAH

(IV. 21-31).

This paragraph is one of the most difficult in the whole Epistle to understand aright; and it is the one which would probably outrage Jewish prejudice more than any other.

The children of Abraham are divided into two classes: the descendants of Sarah free, and the descendants of Hagar slave. The Jews, Sarah's sons, are described as the offspring of Hagar, because they, like Ishmael, are descendants by nature; the Gentile Christians are described

¹ The Phrygian saint of the second century, Avireius Marcellus, travelled "with Paul in his hands"; he mentions no other Apostle or teacher in his epitaph (*Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii. p. 723).

as the offspring of Sarah, because they, like Isaac, are descendants by promise of God.

It must be at once admitted that, if this passage were to be taken simply in its relation to the preceding and following parts of the Epistle, as rising spontaneously in Paul's mind in the sequence of his own philosophic argument, it would be unnecessarily insulting and offensive to the Jews, weak as an argument, and not likely to advance his purpose of changing the current of feeling among the Galatians.

Now Lightfoot's interpretation of verse 21 is, "Will ye not listen to the Law?"—explained by him thus, "Ye who vaunt your submission to the Law, listen while I read you a lesson out of the Law"—and if we follow this interpretation, we must regard the passage as arising in the free development of Paul's argument within his own mind.

The rival interpretation, adopted both in the Authorised and the Revised Version, "Do ye not hear the Law?" *i.e.* "Is not the Law constantly read to you?" (comp. *Acts* xv. 21; *2 Cor.* iii. 14),¹ must therefore be preferred. This leaves it quite open to take the passage as forced on Paul from the outside, *i.e.* as a reply to an argument either used in Galatia by his opponents (and reported to him by Timothy),² or employed in the letter which we hypothetically assume as having perhaps been sent by the Churches to Paul (§ XL.).

This opposition argument must have taken the following form: The Jews are the true sons of Abraham, descended by birth from Sarah, and granted to her by a special promise of God, after hope of offspring in the natural course had ceased; Gentile Christians cannot be regarded as in any way on an equal footing with the true sons, unless

¹ I quote *verbatim* Lightfoot's exposition of this interpretation. Zöckler's interpretation, "Do ye not obey the Law?" misses the real point of the passage. All three interpretations are grammatically possible.

² On the theory stated in § xxxix.

they comply with all the obligations imposed on the true sons. Further, this argument may perhaps have been united with the anti-Pauline view (so often referred to in the Epistle) that the Gentile Christians stood on an inferior platform, but could rise to the higher platform of perfection (iii. 3), as true sons, by accepting the Law and its prescribed ritual.

It may be doubted whether the Judaic emissaries in Galatia were prepared to go quite so far as this argument implies in the direction of admitting Gentiles to the full right of sons of Abraham. Hence it seems more probable that this argument was stated in a letter to Paul by the Churches, explaining their views and doubts.

Accordingly, the paragraph may perhaps be read best as quoting from a letter: "Tell me, you who express to me your desire¹ to come under the Law, do you not know what the Law says? Do you not hear it read regularly in your assembly? You say that the Jews are the true sons, and you are outsiders; and on this ground you justify your desire to come under the Law; but this reasoning is not supported by a correct understanding of the Scripture as contained in the Law. Hagar, the Arabian slave, and her son, the slave—when the allegory is properly interpreted—belong to the same category with the present Jerusalem and her children the Jews, all enslaved to the Law as it was delivered from the Arabian mountain. You, as free from the Law, inheriting through the free Diatheke of God, are classed to the heavenly Jerusalem, your true city and your true home,² of which all we Christians are the children.

¹ "Θέλοντες, *desiring*, and not merely being willing": c. xii. 17. Westcott's note on Hebrews xiii. 18.

² The contrast between an earthly city, Derbe or Iconium, where one is a citizen according to the world, and the heavenly city, the real city of all Christians, is implicit here. Similarly it is implicit (and disregarded by most scholars) in the epitaph of Avircius Marcellus (*Cities and Bishopricks*, ii. p. 724).

Thus you, my brothers, are children of promise (not of mere natural, fleshly birth) like Isaac. You are persecuted by the fleshly children now, just as Isaac, the child of promise, was persecuted by the fleshly child, Ishmael of old. And, just as the slave child Ishmael was cast out and lost his inheritance, so now——.¹ We Christians, all, Jew like me or Gentile like you, my brothers, are sons of the free woman, not of the slave woman."

Thus, as we see, Paul was not voluntarily dragging into his letter a gibe at the Jews. He was saying to the Galatians, "The view you state that the Jews are the true sons of Abraham, and that you ought to make yourselves like them, shows that you do not rightly read the Law. The passages to which you refer are to be interpreted allegorically, not verbally—by the spirit, not by the letter. Literally, the Jews are the sons of Sarah; but, in the spiritual interpretation, you are become the free woman Sarah's children, and the Jews are the sons of the slave woman."

This paragraph seems to assume as a fact of law and society in Galatia that the son of a slave mother by the master of the house is a slave. That was not the old Hebrew custom, for Ishmael, Dan, Asher, etc., are not described as of servile station in the Old Testament.² But it was both Greek and Roman custom; and it was also probably both Galatian and old native Anatolian custom, for Gallic and Phrygian fathers were in the habit of selling into slavery even their free-born children,³ and are not likely to have regarded the son of a slave mother as anything but a slave. Both in North and in South Galatia, therefore, the same custom probably existed.

¹ Paul does not express the analogy fully.

² In Mohammedan law such a son ennobles the slave mother.

³ See Mommsen in *Juristische Abhandlungen: Festgabe für G. Beseler*, 1885, p. 268, quoting Tacitus, *Ann.* iv. 72; Philostratus, *Vit. Apollon.* viii. 7, 12.

XLV. THE CONCLUSION (v. 1).

Paul now sums up the argument of chapters iii. and iv. in the brief conclusion: "It was with a view to our full freedom (and not for any new kind of slavery) that Christ has set us Christians free from the bondage of sin.¹ Stand firm, then, and do not submit yourselves anew to the yoke of slavery."

The rapid variation between "we" and "you" in the passage iv. 21-v. 1 is full of meaning. The MSS. vary a good deal on this point; but the preponderance of evidence is so clear that all the chief editors adopt the same text so far as that variation is concerned, and A.V. and R.V. agree with them therein.

At this point Paul would naturally proceed to the warnings set forth in v. 13 ff.; but he turns away for the moment to a digression, v. 2-12.

XLVI. PERSONAL RECAPITULATION (v. 2-12).

This paragraph is purely personal and parenthetical. The allusion to the yoke of bondage which the Galatians were about to put on themselves leads Paul to insist once more on the terrible danger of the step and the ruinous consequences that must follow from it. The paragraph is very closely akin to iii. 1-6.

You know, says Paul, that your salvation comes through faith. The proof that you have faith lies—in having faith. But, if you yield to their persuasion, and suffer yourselves to be circumcised, you cease to have faith in Christ, you cease to benefit by His grace, and Christ will no longer

¹ The marginal reading in R.V. (preferred by the American Revisers) is undoubtedly right. Lightfoot reads: "Sons of her who is free with the freedom with which Christ set us free. Stand firm, then, etc." It is difficult to sympathize with Lightfoot in discarding the text preferred by R.V., Tischendorf, Zöckler, B. Weiss, etc., and in saying that that text "is so difficult as to be almost unintelligible." A third kind of text in A.V.

profit you, as I protest and reiterate: in that case you put your trust in the Law, and you must trust to it alone, and be a slave to it in its entirety. In itself the act of circumcision has no effect; it is nought; but your accepting it now is a proof that you no longer trust to Christ, that you no longer have faith.

Lightfoot is, indubitably, right in taking the emphatic "I, I Paul"¹ as "an indirect refutation of calumnies." "I, Paul, who have myself preached circumcision forsooth, who say smooth things to please men, who season my doctrine to the taste of my hearers, I tell you, etc."

Verses 7-9. How has this awful change happened, when you were running the race so excellently? Who has had such influence over you? Who has bewitched you? I marvel that you are so inconsequent and inconsistent with yourselves (compare iii. 1). You may be sure that no person who has thus prevented your progress can be a messenger of God (as you once thought that I was). It is not a strong party that is acting thus; but if they once establish a footing among you, then, you know the proverb—*a little leaven!*

Verse 10. But Paul then goes on to express his firm confidence in the judgment and faith of the Galatians. They have been momentarily deceived, but they assuredly will not permanently entertain different views from those which they recently had. Thus the doubt and perplexity which he expressed, iv. 20, the apprehension lest his work among them had been in vain, iv. 11, are dissipated. He knows whom he is addressing; he sees into their soul; and, as he looks, his doubts about the issue disappear.

Verse 10. Punishment must follow: he that has troubled the Galatians has earned his reward, and must submit to it: he has perverted the Gospel of Christ (i. 7),

¹ Ἐγὼ Παῦλος is stronger than "I Paul"; to use ἐγώ in Greek is emphatic, but to use "I" in English is necessary, and carries no emphasis.

and will pay the penalty, however great and important a position he occupies in the Church. This last expression favours Lipsius' view that a single Jew of some standing had come to Galatia and caused the whole trouble.

Verse 11. Being thus carried back to the same topic as in the opening paragraph, i. 6 ff.—the presence of the disturber—Paul glances, as in that passage, at the charge which had wounded him so deeply—viz., that in his conduct to Timothy (*Acts* xvi. 3) he had been a timeserver, shifting his principles to suit his surroundings, preaching circumcision to some, though he refused it to others. As for me, he says, if I preach it, why do they go on to persecute me? Of course, if I am preaching it, then the cross which so scandalizes them, the cross which is their stumbling-block, has been done away, and they have nothing to complain of in my preaching.

Does verse 10 point to punishment from man, and hint that the offender should be dealt with publicly by the Galatian Churches? Surely not. The judgment is left to the hand of God. Then in v. 12 Paul recurs to this thought of the punishment awaiting the guilty party. "I wish," he says, "that they who are turning your moral constitution¹ topsy-turvy would inflict the proper penalty on themselves, and cut themselves off.

In spite of the almost complete unanimity of the recent authorities that v. 12 refers to a different kind of self-inflicted injury, viz., mutilation such as was practised in the worship of the Phrygian goddess, I venture to recur to the rendering of the Authorised Version.² I doubt whether even in this point—the only one about which Paul shows real anger—he would have yielded so completely to mere ill-temper as to say what this favourite interpretation attributes to him. It is true that the ancient

¹ Ἀναστατούντες carries a political metaphor, as Lightfoot rightly sees.

² Printed by the Revised Version in text, with the other interpretation in the margin.

peoples, and many of the modern peoples in the same regions, resort to foul language when they express anger, in circumstances where Anglo-Saxons have recourse to profane language.¹ It would be mere affectation to try to deny or conceal that, on the current interpretation, Paul uses a piece of bad language in the ordinary style of the enraged Oriental, who, regardless of the utter unsuitability of the expression he employs, heaps insult on his enemy, animate or inanimate, man or brute, seeking only to be insulting, and all the better content the more thoroughly he attains this end.

There would be nothing suitable, nothing characteristic, nothing that adds to the force of the passage, in the act which, on the ordinary interpretation, Paul desires that this grave Jew of high standing should perform upon himself. It was expressly forbidden by the Law of Moses. The scornful expression would be a pure insult, as irrational as it is objectionable.

But the Authorised Version gives an excellent sense, adding distinctly to the force of the paragraph. The proper punishment for disturbing the Church was that the offender should be cut off like a useless member: and the wish is expressed that he would cut himself off.

But the objection is advanced that this sense cannot be justifiably elicited in Greek from ἀποκόπτεσθαι: the word in the middle voice is quoted only in the sense of "mutilate oneself," or "cut oneself (in mourning), *i.e.* mourn for."²

¹ The traveller in the East knows that the use of profane language, objectionable as it is, constitutes a really great step in civilization and refinement, compared with the unutterable hatefulness of the style of objurgation used by the angry Oriental. The same style was used in ancient times; and it is almost amusing to observe how, from ignorance of this fact, the commentators treat, for example, Catullus's objurgations against those whom he disliked as sober testimony to their moral character. Catullus would have said much the same about his *pettorrita*, if it broke a wheel, as he says about his enemy, regardless of the meaninglessness of the expression.

² In the latter sense the simple κόπτεσθαι is usual: the force of ἀπό is lost in it.

The objection has good ground, but is, I think, not conclusive. The word *σκάνδαλον* in v. 11 suggests¹ to Paul the words of the Saviour (Mark ix. 43) *ἐὰν σκανδαλίση σε ἡ χεὶρ σου, ἀπόκοψον αὐτήν*.² He therefore continues in v. 12 the thought of v. 10, "I wish they would cut themselves off." If he presses further than was customary the use of the middle form of the verb, he is not out of harmony with the spirit of the middle voice, and he perhaps trusted to the Galatians also recognising the reference to the Saviour's words.

But those who maintain the customary interpretation must recognise frankly what is the character of the thought and language thus attributed to Paul, and should not try, with Lightfoot, to explain it away by saying that this mutilation "must at times have been mentioned by a Christian preacher." Certainly he must have sometimes mentioned it along with other enormities of the pagan ritual; but that would not justify Paul in expressing the hope and wish that a fellow-member of the Christian Church would voluntarily commit this crime upon himself. Dr. Sanday rightly sees that the expression is indefensible, and can only be regretted.³

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ The fact that the word is used in a different relation in the one case and in the other furnishes no argument against the suggestion. In v. 10 the thought of the suitable punishment, severing from the Church which the offender has wronged, is in Paul's mind. In v. 11 the word *σκάνδαλον* comes in. The juxtaposition suggests that saying of Jesus in which *σκανδαλίζω* is in juxtaposition with cutting off.

² Compare verse 45 (of the foot). Matt. xviii. 8 reports the same saying, but uses *ἐκκόπτειν* in place of *ἀποκόπτειν*. Paul thought of the saying in Mark's form.

³ I have not quoted so often as I should like his commentary (in which many things are put with admirable clearness), because the author has protested against its opinions being taken as his mature views so long after they were written.

SOMETHING BETTER THAN HUSKS.

AMONG the most satisfactory rewards of work on a Bible Encyclopædia is the removal of difficulties which have sometimes deterred students and caused perplexity to the public readers of Scripture. People may not think that much can be got out of the study of "husks." Most of us, it is true, are well aware that the "husks" which "the swine did eat" were not what we should call "husks." The Revised Version warns the reader of this: the "husks," it says in the margin, are "the pods of the carob tree"—a very nutritious though not luxurious food. Not only in Palestine, but in Cyprus, the carob tree grows in abundance, and its value for the feeding of cattle and horses, and especially for pigs, is fully appreciated. It has not hitherto been observed that the pods of the carob tree are referred to several times in the Old Testament. The arguments for a deeper textual criticism which I have pressed on the attention of the readers of the EXPOSITOR might be strengthened by numerous other instances; but no instance, perhaps, speaks more eloquently than, at any rate, the first of those which I shall quote. It would be easy for me to prefix an elaborate discussion of the learned opinions of writers who have endeavoured to explain the received text. Perhaps I lay myself open to some disparagement because I do not on this occasion adopt the time-honoured practice. But my time is limited, and I am sure that students will easily be able to find out for themselves what has been said on these passages in the most esteemed commentaries. This, then, is the rendering of 2 Kings vi. 25 in the Revised Version :

And there was a great famine in Samaria: and, behold, they besieged it, until an ass's head was sold for fourscore pieces of silver and the fourth part of a kab of dove's dung for five pieces of silver.

Surely this is hardly what we expect; the narrative is rather painfully interrupted by improbabilities. This is the rendering of what I venture to call the true, the original text:

Now there was a great famine in Samaria (behold, they were besieging it), until a homer of lentils (חֶמֶד עֲרִשִׁים) was sold for fifty shekels (see LXX.), and a quarter of a cor (כֶּרֶם) of carob pods (קִרְיָבִים) for five shekels.

Thus pages of learned dissertation become obsolete. Never mind whether the Arabs give the name "sparrow's dung" to a species of *salsola* or soap plant, or not. Never mind whether the people were to be excused for eating ass's flesh or not, nor trouble yourself to explain the choice of the "head" in particular. "Head" is a slightly distorted form of עֶרֶשׁ, a part of עֲרִשִׁים, "lentils." But I need not, I think, pause to explain what any student of Hebrew will see at a glance.

The next passage I shall not quote; to be able to remove it from our Bibles is a real, if a slight, service to the community. It is 2 Kings xviii. 27 with which Isaiah xxxvi. 12 agrees. The true text—not quite so certainly so in all points as the corrected text of the preceding passage, but certainly so in the main point—is this:

But the Rab-shakeh said, etc., Has he not sent me to the men who sit on the wall, that they may eat their (קִרְיָבִיהֶם) carobs and drink their sour wine with you?

We see from the striking passage treated above that one of the commonest features of a siege was that the inhabitants were reduced to eat carob pods, like horses or pigs, in order to live. This at once suggests a necessary correction of a well-known passage in the noble exordium of the collection of Isaiah's prophecies. We see from the necessary correction which I shall offer that when the prophet spoke Jerusalem was not actually besieged (which, by the way,

throws great doubt on the correctness of the words in Isaiah i. 8 rendered "as a besieged city)." Isaiah i. 19, 20 runs thus in the English Version :

If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land ;
But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword,
For the mouth of the LORD hath spoken it.

Any one can see that the parallelism between lines 1 and 2 is not perfect. Of course, this can be defended. A poet or a prophet is not the slave of his poetical or rhetorical forms. He may break through them to produce a greater effect. But this is not all ; the Hebrew phrase *חָרַב תֹּאכְלוּ* is very difficult. The meaning is not clear. Others render, "Ye shall be made to eat the sword" ; while Duhm, altering two points, renders, "Ye shall eat the sword." None of these views are quite natural. The true text certainly is :

If ye be willing and obedient, the best (fruits) of the land shall ye eat ;
But if ye refuse and rebel, carob pods shall ye eat (*חֲרָבִים תֹּאכְלוּ*),
For Jahwè's mouth hath spoken it.

חֲרָבִים was probably written 'חַרַב ; the mark of abbreviation was no doubt very early employed by Jewish scribes. This last correction was suggested, we may almost say, by a Rabbi in the Midrash, but apparently as a play upon words, not quite as a correction of the text. That *חַרִיב* has hitherto only been known from New Hebrew and from Syriac is no objection to these corrections. It is not asserted, so far as I know, that the carob tree is of late importation into Palestine. Many such observations have occurred in the course of the work entailed on me by the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. I should not have referred to this, however, but for the special interest of these particular corrections. In mentioning them, it is natural to make the innocent avowal that the preparation of an article on

"HUSKS" led the present writer to these results. There is plenty of room for a re-examination of words seemingly as unimportant as "Dove's Dung" and "Husks."

T. K. CHEYNE.

THE TWENTY-THIRD PSALM.

It is not easy to speak to any one about those things which he knows best and loves most. They have, among his associations and affections, a setting which no one but himself can appreciate, and which even the most sympathetic words of another must in a measure alienate and disturb. The slightest, subtlest change of atmosphere or tone will react keenly upon the heart when habit and affection have made it sensitive and tender. No one can speak, so as quite to please us, about our own father or our chosen friend, or about our favourite garden or picture or song.

Nor is it easier to speak about things that are very simple and yet very perfect. Some things are, we know, too elementary to admit of analysis, and too obvious to need explanation; but that is not what we mean in this reference. There is another kind of simplicity still more difficult to touch with words—that simplicity, namely, to which men of creative genius, by an alchemy of their own, reduce the results of their intensest thought and their farthest research. The longest pains of the musician and poet and painter issue in what seems the spontaneous growth of an hour; and, at its best effort, all their rare power results in the production of some little thing of simple beauty. All that the men themselves have been and are, all that they have won and know, sooner or later is reduced to a final process, and seems naturally to realize itself in one supreme moment when they are at their best and yet their simplest. Day and night, summer and winter, storm and calm, soil

and sky in their life, as in the tree, bring them at last to a plain beauty like that of the wild blossom or the wild berry ; and who can say much about what is so perfectly simple and beautiful as these are ? It is easier to speak about Browning than about Keats ; easier to analyse Meredith than Scott ; easier to explain St. Paul than St. John.

Both these difficulties present themselves together when we try to speak about the twenty-third Psalm. No words in any language are more familiar than those of its verses, and none are more hallowed. They are words with a living voice in them ; they have spoken to the church's heart ; they have affected the sub-consciousness of the human soul. They are, in our life, like a brook that runneth in the way ; which is heard even when hidden from our sight, and has a peaceable influence over us though we sometimes forget that it is there. They put a music into our life from its morning to its evening ; they murmur in our memory with the double power of a cradle-song and a requiem. Strong men in the mid-strife of life's busiest day grow tender and will falter over them, so associated as they are with the hours of clean white thought and holy fancy around a mother's knee ; and, at the close of the day, they are the last low croon of tired souls when they soothe themselves to the long sleep.

But though it be difficult to speak about these verses because they are so familiar and so dear, yet this is not all nor most. There is another difficulty ; for this psalm which all men love is simplicity itself. It speaks about things which everybody knows, and it is of itself complete and all-sufficient. It is a plain little psalm—a singing psalm of common grey wing and homely feather ; and, like the singing of those birds that give music, the one to the morning and the other to the midnight, its perfection and sweetness baffle words. Yet we all feel it, we each understand it, in a moment—the child as immediately as the man. It thrills

us ; its emotion becomes part of us, as if its suggestion came from within rather than from without ; and it is so spontaneous and natural that we feel as if we ourselves had thought and said it all. There is no effort in it any more than in the prattle of a child ; and, in the elementary and most highly-sanctioned use of the word, it is *sensuous*, winning its way to our soul as easily and gently as a fragrance or a flavour wins its way to a sense. Its effect upon us is more like the stirring of an instinct than the record of an experience.

These considerations make our duty in dealing with this psalm both delicate and tender. Even though we regarded it merely as a bit of Hebrew literature, a thing of rhythm and measure, a lyrical survival of earliest spiritual art, there is no good in pouncing upon it, and tearing away the spirit from the letter, and stripping it bare to the bones. We should only spoil and silence if we anatomized what is so complete and perfect ; and we should "offend against the generation" of the saints if we dislodged them and it from their familiar and dear relations to one another. We would rather here touch the notes—one by one and all—and ask each of you to listen to the response of his own soul. This plain-song of human life is set to music which is awakened within ourselves by the words ; and, if we are in spiritual tone and have the complete equipment of all our finer powers, every stave of the psalm will make melody in our heart. It does more than charm us ; it tests and proves us. We shall one day need all the trust and all the comfort and help of which the psalm tells ; and we may now learn, by means of it, if the connection and attachments between our soul and God hold good and sure.

The origin of this psalm must always have an interest of its own. A stream so comforting and so constant makes us think of the fountain, whence it flows and wherein is the hiding of its power. The mildest use of the historical

method in this instance seems to give happy results. For, when we follow this psalm up historically, we do not come to an open source bare and unconcealed, where anybody may have dug—it matters not who! We are not brought thereby to an artificial well, built in—by whose uninteresting hands we care not, if only the waters flow! We find what is more fascinating than that. We are led up into the scenery of a life where all around are the suggestion and the outgrowth of quick and varied human experiences—the rapture and peril of many lives in one. There is a *genius loci*, where this psalm springs. It rises in a haunted wood. There is maze and thicket, and gloom and glade. The place is veiled and fringed with mystery; it is full of whispers and shadows; it is peopled with memories; it is like a multitudinous dream. The wood has its secret, and the psalm knows it; and that is why at its source it breathes and trembles so. For beneath and behind its flowing there is a heart that is trying to say, and cannot say *all*.

Whilst the psalm of itself seems naturally to lead up into the life in which it takes its rise, yet even there it has woven around it a little beautiful mystery. The stream makes the path to its own well-head; but the well in the wood has its first and innermost secret hidden and guarded by fine powers. The passion of spring, and the patience of the autumn, and “many a summer’s silent fingering” have been there to seclude and protect; and over and around are grass and tangle, the bending branch and the briar, and trailing tendrils of leaf and flower. So this psalm is not allowed merely to disclose itself to us, breaking soil at our feet and, before our eyes, issuing on its own open and unattended way. There is here not only a delicate and suggestive concealment of the fountain, but the course of the psalm becomes at once as interesting as its source. For it has found or stirred so many spiritual affinities, that it is all clustered round with the growth of congenial life;

and we cannot disentangle the fine fretwork of association and experience which now entwine around it. These accessories have a vital relation to the verses; for the sympathies and fidelities of human nature seem to have such essential attachment to the psalm that they cling to it as if saying, "All our well-springs are in thee." So the psalm has been giving and *getting* these thousands of years. It is now far richer and more wonderful than its author left it. It is ours in a larger sense than it is his; for humanity claims and has appropriated it as its own. It is truer even than its author knew; for the Church has verified it.

Though it be true that, in the largest sense, this is a psalm of the church rather than of any individual saint, yet it, more than most, seems to demand and suggest a life and personal circumstances. Its authorship never can be quite so indifferent a matter as some say. The weather does count when we estimate the love and hope in the breast of the bird that sings in a wet and wintry day; and it does make a difference—the *kind* of life out of which this song of humanity arose, and of which it is the finest and fullest expression. The character and complexity of the elements that were mingled in the secret vats do count with us when we estimate the truth which has been thus—to use the word literally—*expressed*. We shall feel neither the grip nor the tenderness of the psalm until we distinctly realize the stress and pain in the life regarding which it is the harmonious and complete and final utterance. Historically or imaginatively we must see a face, when we hear this voice; and, by either process, there is only one face to see.

By every spiritual test, and in spite of there being some Bacon-Shakespeare men among Hebrew critics, the authorship of this psalm is indisputable. It was written either by David or (so to say, if only we may say it without too much levity) by some one else of the same name: we must here

accept David or create him. There is a "lifelike" of experiences finding interpretation and outlet here. It is not any part, but it is the whole of a life that is involved. A shepherd minstrel does not here whistle along the hillside a careless song, nor a minstrel king sing at ease "in an house of cedar." Beneath and behind and all around this sweet wildness as of native notes lie the trials and struggles, the sins and sorrows, the agony and the prayers and the tears of a sore and stormy life; but here is the calm, mature, and highest reading of it all:—"The Lord is my Shepherd"! Every man has got the truth of his life when he has found the Divine thought which runs through it, and which explains, and justifies, and unifies all its parts. From some men we receive it as a philosophy, from others as the poetry, of human life; the one is the precipitate, the other is a fragrant distillation, from the same severe process of consciously living a life under the power and pressure of the Eternal. Of the two results, poetry is not the less essential though more ethereal, nor less real because the more intangible; it is truth in its most diffusive and universal form, and at its finest power; it creates an atmosphere; it becomes an inspiration; it quickens. The deepest meanings of life, when revealed to the rarest souls, become a Divine message to mankind, and, when most adequately spoken, will make music. The poetry of God becomes music on David's lips here; and, with his high message, he still comes about the doors of human life. The song he sings is simple and sweet to hear; but in it life calls to life in its far recesses. He is his own lyrist, and the heartstrings are very tense; and none to whose heart his words go home will be content till they have seen and know the minstrel; nor will they love the sweet singer less when they know him as a man of sorrows.

David is in this psalm at his fullest and best as a man and a poet. As a man his earlier and later years are

“bound each to each by natural piety”; and as a poet he is at that simplest which is his best, and his song, which is lyrically and artistically perfect, is the result of a supreme hour of his creative mood when his work seems artless and effortless, and yet is “of imagination all compact.” Yet the combined and unique strain of his whole life is in this quiet result. There have been deep life soundings taken to find this pearl of great price; and it is the equivalent of his vast wealth of character and genius. There is one life—the poet’s own—running through this psalm, and animating it from first to last, and there is one pleasing and tinted figure giving the whole its imaginative shape and hue. It is a unity, and yet there is a difference between the first and last halves of its perfect whole, for there are youth and age in the psalm just as there are in life itself. We would defend the poet’s work. It has had rough usage. It is prosaic treatment of the psalm to dovetail the latter part into the earlier, making the two halves adhere in a mechanical way. It is a dull suggestion that the thought and fancy of the poet are in two sections, separate and distinct and different. There are no sections in a poet’s work! It is not put together, and it cannot be taken to pieces, in sections! It is the artisan, and not the artist, whose work is “mortised and adjoined”! There is here grafting and growth of part to part; it is living work. One life pervades and is fulfilled in the new and the old, the first and the last; and one living and harmonious effort reaches all through it to the one result in fragrance and fruit. It is harsh and incongruous to introduce blood revenge or the hospitality of couch and table into an open-air song of the shepherd and his sheep. The critical brain, sharp though it be, is too blunt a tool to apply here. A slight poetical impulse and some spiritual sympathy will carry us along the living length of the little psalm without doing a single line of it hurt, or putting strain on a single

word, and will enable us to feel the thrill of its spirit all the way. We know that,

“A lover would not tread
A cowslip on the head,
Though he should dance from eve to peep of day”;

and a touch of interpretative fantasy may at a time stand the critic of the Psalms in good stead. The shepherd is as plain in the midst and last of this psalm as in the first of it—just the dear, familiar shepherd doing his shepherd duty with his shepherd surroundings! A little more alert than leisurely, and with club swung round to his hand instead of his staff, but the same shepherd, brave and wise and good in paths of fear, as he who sauntered with his flock beside the still waters! His sheep huddle around him, as he leads through the gloomy ravine, and share his sense of peril. And what would he there in a place so haunted of wolf and bear? “In his heart are the ways” of one who leads from the good to the better, and who measures all his goings to some higher end. Beyond that valley of shadow and fear is the place he seeks—a true shepherd’s garden, a little paradise for his sheep. It is a garden enclosed, and the valley is its gateway. There, encircled by the rocks where prowl the foes of the flock, is the fair spot, knee-deep with grass and flowers—nature’s own table spread with food convenient; the odorous trees, shedding their gum, are there to refresh and alleviate; and there, the bright-eyed spirit of all the happy place! is the unceasing well—ever with careless hands spilling its gift of waters—not caring how it gives, if only freely enough! Such an end justifies the shepherd’s means—the valley, the shadow, and the fear! And the contentment and peace of the flock seem to say: “Thou spreadest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies; Thou hast anointed my head with oil; my cup runneth over.” Thus the whole psalm is purely pastoral, a musical parable of a good shepherd and his sheep. From

first to last its note, its scenery, its breath, are all and only Arcadian. We are out of doors the whole time.

This beautiful unity in the composition of his psalm is an unconscious testimony on the part of the author to the unity which he saw that the purpose of God had made in his chequered life. It is pleasing to find that David was able on review to attach his severest and sternest experiences of life to his gentlest and sweetest; and that he could so set and see them all alike in the light of the far away and the Divine, that there was actually no difference between them. The tragic and the terrible were subdued to the same idyllic beauty and tenderness as lay on the hills of his youth. He could sing of them together; they went to the same tune. On the same strings, and to the same key, he was able to sing the whole story of his life—only glowing a little as he went on, and accentuating with an added spiritual emphasis his assurance of the goodness and mercy which had led him from less to more, and was leading from the good to the best. There *are* two parts in the psalm, and they are different; an old man could not have written the first part, and a young man would not write the last. But by looking at the very difference between the two parts, at a deeper level than that of words and form, we shall the better see their spiritual affinity and find their essential oneness.

David's boyhood days would be full of spiritual visitings and questionings. From his pious ancestry religion would be in his blood. He says that he "set the Lord always before him," I suppose whether he had harp, or sling, or shepherd's staff in hand. The only literature of his youth would be his fragment of our completed Bible, with its suggestive snatches of early Hebrew song; and it must have been the supple brain of his youth that was trained to such a deft after-skill in verse. He must have begun young, and his first rhymes would be of his God. It is

difficult not to enter into the thought of this sensitive boy in the solitude of his pastoral hills, to whom the Scripture of his home, and the word of his peasant father there, alike had given the one supreme and awe-inspiring conviction that God had the constant control and care of his life; and it is easy to imagine how, in his fine leisure by night and day, this inevitable thought of God would haunt him—oppressing, harassing him, and teasing him “out of thought, as doth eternity”—until he got the mastery of it by bringing his own thoughts into a happy relation to it, and his life into alliance with it, and then was able ever after to draw from it his liberty and his joy. This higher mood came to him, one may well conceive, in “the sleep that is among the lonely hills,” when he made his flock to rest at noon and when all the hills were dreaming dreams and when he too had his dream. Then he saw all the mystery with clear eyes in the lower light of his own relation to his sheep. “What do these silly flocks think of me? What can they say of my concern for them, and my constant eye upon them, and my shifting of their pasture, and my so often compelling them to go whither they would not?” Then it all flashed upon him in a moment. He said it—he was so happy that he sang it, and his song has filled the world—“The Lord is my Shepherd.”

A poet's youth is littered with scraps of early verses. They may be fragile and slight, but they have for him a charm all their own—they have the spell of his life's *faërie*. David having begun would not easily stop; and we daresay he threw away many a sweet verse that cost him some pleasant poetic pains, just as any shepherd-boy flings away the chaplet of wild rushes that he has woven:—

The while his fingers plait the scentless wreath,
He finds some pleasure in his idle skill;
At even he leaves it withering on the heath,
Or strews its fragments on the moorland rill.

The first lines of this psalm have upon them the dew of their poet's youth. The sunny cheerfulness of them; the light, swift measure; the careless, gliding, easy rhythm; the naturalness and the grace all suggest that they are a reminiscence of his youth—a fragment of verse which David found when he was traversing in later years his earlier memory; and with what pathos he would pick up and treasure what once he so carelessly threw away! Yes, sure enough, this is a young man's voice: "I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; He leadeth me beside the still waters." The sunshine of morning is glittering on these dewy lines still, and a light heart in them is treading life's paths lightly! But this is an old man's use of the early lines. The words of his youth take a soberer tone on the lips of his age. They mean more than he at first knew. They were still true, but truer than he at first supposed. He accepted them from his earlier self, and with a trembling hand set his seal to them as true; and in their larger meaning he consecrated them with the tears of his age. Happy is the man who, like David, can in any way bring through an unclouded memory the sunshine of youth to relieve the shadows of age, and who from the same source can glorify the severest realities of after experience with a touch of the ideal!

But life had grown a far more intense and serious thing than David ever dreamed of in his youth. From no great depth of his being he sang his early song of God; it was an emanation from the sunshine and open-eyed integrity of his young being. God elected this man to tell the truth of life in deeper strains out of the darker depths of his own soul. The still waters flowed softly at first, but afterwards the life was so deeply pierced that they ran blood awhile; and since then, in fiercer volume, they have tumbled and been broken in many a gorge. So his later song is coloured by experiences which he never anticipated at first:—

Heartache, care, distress,
Blighted hope and loneliness.

He had known the perils by Saul's throne and around his own, the peril of friends and the peril of foes, the pain of the wound that the traitor gives from behind, and that which a son can give when the father takes him to his bosom. The step in life suggested by the verses is still strong, but no longer light. The singer's measure is still pastoral, but it is slower. The shepherd thought is still kept, but it is now grave and serious: "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil." That is not the way a young man feels or speaks about either life or death. That is an old man's voice, and an old man's thought and word. From his sunny retrospect, under sunny memories, he turns to this solemn forecast and faces all the shadows as they darken to one gloom.

With his experiences of life, David's experience of God has correspondingly increased and intensified. At first he thought that the great Shepherd was doing all His shepherding for "His own name's sake." With an easy heart he trusted God in youth; one of many, only one of all, in the flock, he was content with the general care which God has of His own; he accepted the pleasant situation, "He leadeth me; He restoreth me; He maketh me to lie down; He is doing it all for His own name's sake; it is the Shepherd's own great and gracious way." But now he has come to feel quite differently; and, in his age, he sings as it all had been done by God "for my sake"—so intense and personal is his sense of God's consideration and care.

With extraordinary spiritual delicacy David veils his most sad memory of the Shepherd's tenderness and help, and softly here turns that reminiscence into this forecast. He knows where and when he so learned the comfort of the Shepherd's rod and staff, that he can now trust Him in

any valley of fear ; but he does not say. He allows no one to traverse with him his gloomiest memories, nor to look down his life's darkest path ; and he leaves hidden that passage in the past where, under its own shadow and amidst its own scenery, sin wrought out its own consequences, and where "mine enemies" had him in their fullest power. Yet there it was that the psalmist learned, when the Shepherd transacted with him face to face and hand to hand alone, to feel, "He loveth me, and giveth Himself for me ; and He does it for my sake." And out of this bitter root in a buried memory has grown this lily of heavenly peace which has seeded itself along all our paths of death. "Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil : for Thou art with me ; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me."

David's life had gone astray. He had been as a lost sheep. He had known the paw of the lion and the bear. And the Shepherd had left the ninety and nine and gone after the one that was lost. This had changed and deepened his whole feeling towards God. The Shepherd and he had come to closer quarters. Their relation had become intensely personal. David had needed, and had had, the Shepherd all to himself. They had been in perils together alone ; and there, when bruised and helpless, David had learned that he was beloved of the Shepherd. David "had dwelt in safety by Him ; He had covered him all the day long, and he had dwelt between His shoulders." So, at the memory of such mercy, and out of so intimate an experience, the song grows more intense, and the throb of new heart pulses come out, as he says : "*Thou art with me*" ; "*Thy rod and staff comfort me*" ; "*Thou spreadest my table*" ; "*Thou anointest my head.*" It had all been so personal, and there had been so much patience and such pity—the Shepherd had been like a father to him !

There, then, lies before us David's retrospect of his life !

“All the days of my life” are spread out to sight as he sings—his boyhood and his manhood, his shepherd years and his years as king, his days in green fields and by still waters, and his days of drift and fear in mountain gorge and mountain gloom. The scenery and the biography of the psalm are strangely blended; it is all delicately allusive and spiritually suggestive, as it is inimitably artistic and perfect—those happy fields at first, and now these ravines of death-like shadow! Is life always like this—the green and then the gloom—the sunshine and then the shadow—the shining morning fields and then the black crags at night—the open freedom at first, and at last a blind journey in a narrow pass? Though it be so, David can yet sing of it, and tune and time his steps by this song of the past into life’s farther and future distances. Goodness and mercy had followed him, and would follow him. David had doubtless seen, some who read may have, we ourselves lately saw by Ben Nevis, a rainbow that was resting, on the one hand, among fields and streams, and which sprent with green and gold all the happy plain; but, on the other, it was thrusting its glory like swords into the clefts of the rocky hill. It glistened and beautified here; it dazzled and amazed up there. That rainbow is around our life. Goodness and mercy have followed us. Goodness is mere goodness—quiet, peaceful, constant; it is the common sunshine attending everybody, but now and again “doing wondrously” for a little while in order to arrest our eye and teach us how it does wondrously for us always. But mercy is goodness, and something more; it is the little over which we had no right to expect; it is goodness accentuated and heightened by circumstances, like sunshine and rain “on the wilderness” given, as if for the pure pleasure of giving, “to satisfy the waste and desolate ground”; it is not merely a general care, but personal considerateness of us on the part of God; it is provision in spite of our faith-

lessness and thanklessness ; it is love finding us in forbidden places, and guiding us patiently in spite of the waywardness and wilfulness of the wandering. Surely in all this the thought of the psalmist is transcending the thought of shepherd-goodness and shepherd-care, and is catching the light of the unrisen and unrevealed truth of the Divine Fatherhood ! For this mercy which has followed him has been like a father's when he pitieth a child.

The strength of the psalm, however, is in its pressure towards the future. These memories feed hope. The pause to accumulate past experiences increases the psalmist's power to advance on the unknown. The "carry" of his song is towards far horizons. His faith, which has crept so long past hindrance and hazard, at last takes flight and bears away, for love and hope are now its wings ; and he casts himself at the end without fear upon God's ampler provisions for life, and sings himself out of sight to this note, "And I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever." Surely our imagination may rise a little higher here than to the notion of a temple in Jerusalem ! Surely we are here to think of that more elementary and essential idea, of which the temple was but a stately, but temporary, expression ! Surely we may dare to believe that the feeling of the Fatherhood of God was upon David's heart here ! He is at a more simple and primary way of thinking and speaking than that of wishing for a temple and its service. He has been feeling and speaking as a shepherd ; he is on the lines of his earliest life ; he is a boy again in simplicity of desire and of words to utter his large natural wants ; and, above all things, he wanted a home.

The last is the shepherd-boy and shepherd-king's word *for himself*. By a spontaneous and pleasing touch of fancy, like a musical transposition, the shepherd-singer transfers the thought of the needs of the flock to that of his own need. The wandering about by day even in pleasant places

and the sleep by night in tent or cave ; the adventure and victory in the dark and even the affectionate watching of the flock at noon ; the vigil of the fold when it was late, and the pastoral *réveille* at daybreak, all alike had in them elements of trouble and something of fret ; and, after all the experiences of the wood and field, the return to his father's house would be a welcome and supreme hour in David's early life. So the last word in the psalm of his life is about home. It was a life of ups and downs ; it was here and there ; it was to and fro ; it fatigued and worried and strained ; it had conditions of unsatisfactoriness and unrest in it, and the shepherd needed rest as much as the sheep. But all these experiences of fatigue and strain were, after all, only the incidentals of life in the lower rooms where the son is as one who serveth. And here is the breathing-out of the larger desire and the larger hope in one, "And I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever." What a wide and welcome door thus stands open at the end of it all ! After the wandering and weariness, after the dark pass under the shadow, after even all the goodness and mercy of the way—a Father's house, a home *for ever* !

In this interpretation of the psalm we may seem to have intruded on New Testament ground, and from Jesus Christ carried back some truths and assigned them to David. We have not meant to do so, and would justify what we have done. For the closing stanza of the psalm demands a larger interpretation than it usually receives. It suggests an emotion and hope in David's heart which anticipated and went forth to meet what was revealed only long afterwards in Christ. The ardour of his soul quickened the wish that God might be his Father into a daring thought of the Fatherhood. But, as with his spiritual thought of sacrifice, this thought of God appeared before "the times were ripe." It was a real and true thought to him ; it came

to his soul as a divine surprise ; but the season for it in God's great year was not yet ; and, when it was planted out, it took no root, it faded of the frost. In this, however, when an adventurous instinct thus moved, David's soul had a moment's reminiscence of Father and home, and there was not only affinity, but connection, between him and The Christ. The Divine idea, entrusted to Jesus for complete unfolding, grew quick in David's soul, and on his lips gave this sign, and took its own shape in his life, thus long before its full time was come. Does not this throw some light on the mystical words of Jesus Himself, "I am the *root* and the offspring of David" ? This partial and implicit thought of the Fatherhood, which we here find the Spirit "saying in David," was perhaps one of the many which Jesus came not to destroy but fulfil, translating its "Doubtless Thou art our Father" into His own "Our Father which art in heaven" ; and this passage might be one of those which Jesus gave His disciples when He told them what was written "in the Psalms concerning Himself."

We certainly know that the Master's lips, when the fullest grace was poured into them and when they spoke His two most perfect prose-poems, were framed as here we find that David's were. For His revelation of His Father and of Himself, in its two most touching utterances, is found in His pathetic little idyll of home life with its story of a father's love and a wandered son, and in His pastoral narrative of the Good Shepherd. In these two parables together we have the evangel of salvation elaborated by Jesus to its most irresistible charm. Indeed, Jesus seems almost to take suggestion from David and rise from the Shepherdhood to the Fatherhood, verifying David's desire and dream, when He declares "I and the Father are one," and combining the two thoughts to a higher power when He says "My Father is greater than I, and no one is able to pluck them out of My Father's hand."

So this psalm seems to carry the Father's pity as well as the Shepherd's care, and can stand without strain a Christian interpretation; it even suggests the Shepherd sacrifice as a means to the Father's salvation. It is a Christian hymn as much as it is a Hebrew psalm; its imagination is more penetrative than picturesque; it has in it the wisdom of the Eternal and the love of the Divine ready to realize themselves through death in human salvation. Those great elemental and formative thoughts of man and God, which religion with every new revelation can only recast and recombine, are here in their power; and so deep a mystery of truth was never said more simply, and so Divine a comfort was never sung more sweetly, than when David had this inspiration, "The Lord is my Shepherd."

From the psalm as a whole we may learn to take a simpler thought of our life. It is not so complicated and contradictory as it seems. Each life is the expression and working out of a Divine thought. God is there working through the real towards the ideal. Bring the simple thoughts of a shepherd and a father and a home into our life, and they explain and inspire. The Shepherdhood of Christ and the Fatherhood of God are the two most comforting assurances of Scripture; and to acquiesce in the Shepherd's way is to fulfil the Father's good pleasure. Every life needs shepherding; and a shepherd knows his sheep by their weakness and faults, and measures his care of them thereby; and when the Good Shepherd calls His own sheep, He calls them by the name which suggests at once their failing and His help, and His call thus becomes a tender appeal, for it is both a remembrancer and a promise. But our life has even finer shepherding than that, for He is "the Shepherd . . . of our souls." He knows our wandering thoughts and our unruly impulse and our misleading desires, and "maketh" all these "to lie

down" as quietly as the cloud-flocks of a summer sky "shepherded all day by gentle winds." He gives all who follow Him of His own life every day; and, in all His word and way with them, there trembles the responsibility of His Father's love and a silent reference to His Father's face. "Of all whom Thou gavest me, I have lost none."

We may further learn to take a hopeful view of life. We are saved by hope; and the mother-thought of this psalm is hope. "Goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life." Provision is promised against want and weariness and wandering; and each dark valley through which we pass is made a door of hope to some larger room of life made ready with some new good, the last and darkest leading to the largest and best. "For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall be their Shepherd." We may not get all we want, but shall have all we need. God transacts with us largely on the principle of compensation, and He has great reserves in Eternity. There is a splendid indifference as to detail, and an assurance of hope worthy of one whose trust is in God, when this psalmist teaches us to say, "I shall not want"—I shall want for nothing! True faith casts everything on a boundless hope.

We may also learn to introduce into our life the power of the Eternal. The words "*for ever*," when heard along a man's life, awaken his instincts and call up the reserve powers of his soul. They co-ordinate and graduate all his interests and all his faculties. First things stand first, and his powers take rank according to their dignity. Passing powers are devoted to passing things, and eternal powers to eternal things. And when passing interests and passing powers fail, the exercise and play of the Divine become more constant and free. Men begin to live above the world by living above the flesh; and, at the level of the Divine life, they live in its power. To those who live in the Spirit, eternity becomes desirable and attractive; it is the natural

and only outlet for lives which Jesus Christ has shepherded and inspired. And when their souls prompt them most towards some land that is very far off where their life may have its true combination and full expansion, men have to rise very high and sustain their faith at high levels by strong love and hope, like the birds that migrate which bear up into air above the attractions and currents of the earth, the easier to speed them on their far way.

ARMSTRONG BLACK.

ON THE RELATION OF THE DISCOURSES OF
OUR LORD RECORDED IN S. JOHN III.
AND VI. TO THE INSTITUTION OF THE
TWO SACRAMENTS.

THE place assigned in the doctrine and Liturgy of the Church of England to the Sacraments of Holy Baptism and Holy Communion may be marked by the words of the Catechism, that Christ ordained them as "*generally necessary to salvation.*" To very many, within as well as without that Church, such a place appears out of proportion to the place they fill in the teaching of Christ, and the place He would have assigned them in His Church. And with regard to the Holy Communion in particular, such a place seems disproportionate to the place it fills in the Apostolic writings of the New Testament. Let us for a moment put ourselves in their position. Those of them who study the Acts and Epistles with regard to Holy Baptism—they are lamentably few—turn to the Gospels and say, "Why, S. John does not even record the institution; in S. Matthew there is the order to baptize, we grant; the words in S. Mark xvi. 16 require it too; but there is no positive mention of water as an essential sacramental means; while the teaching of S. John the Baptist, ratified by Christ in Acts i. 5, speaks

of a spiritual baptism ('with the Holy Ghost').” Such a frame of mind subtly breathes a spirit which discounts much of the teaching on and references to Holy Baptism in the Acts and Epistles; or if it does not exactly do this, leads them to regard the use of water as described in Acts as a temporary and non-essential accompaniment of the Baptism of the Spirit, no more essential to that spiritual baptism than, *e.g.*, the anointing with oil of which S. James speaks to prayers for the recovery of the sick. “If Christ,” they say, “had contemplated an outward sacramental act as generally essential to the new birth, such a universal order, such a supremely important essential, would have found a more prominent place in His ministerial teaching than in the bare order to baptize in His closing charge.” A person so minded dissents emphatically from the teaching of the Catechism that Baptism as therein described is a Sacrament “*generally necessary to salvation.*”

Similarly with regard to the Holy Communion. There are very many who regard the words “*generally necessary to salvation*” as containing teaching out of all proportion to the place that Sacrament fills in the New Testament. They point to the records of the institution and say, “Christ does not use such language of it.” They point to the Epistles and say, “Surely if it were of the supreme importance of being ‘*generally necessary to salvation,*’ it would fill in S. Paul a place proportionate to that filled by, *e.g.*, the doctrine of justification by faith.” Such a frame of mind once started minimizes unconsciously the significance of the passage in 1 Corinthians xi., and the incidental references to the Holy Communion in the Acts, and is stamped with the general impression that the Sacrament filled no really substantial place in Christ’s teaching of the Apostles. This is strengthened by the fact that S. John records the institution of neither Sacrament.

This paper is an attempt to show from S. John’s Gospel

that both Sacraments did fill a substantial place in our Lord's mind and teaching of the Apostles throughout the ministry, and that the actual institution was the ordered end of such teaching. I am not indifferent to the support given to the statement that they are "generally necessary to salvation" by Apostolic life, practice, and writing, but I believe that S. John's Gospel shows in a peculiar way that they belong as such to the mind of Christ and His teaching. The strength of the argument depends largely on the character of the Fourth Gospel. I take it for granted that we acknowledge that that Gospel represents a later form of presentation of words and acts of Christ than that presented in the Synoptists; that it is doctrinal and contemplative, while they are historical; that it presupposes such a knowledge of facts as they present, and contains a retrospective selection of incidents and teaching to which, from their own character, they had not done full justice, and yet which must be known to appreciate fully some things they record—incidents and teaching which, on the other hand, require the synoptic knowledge as a preliminary to grasping their significance.

Such an unfolding of the significance and many-sidedness of words and works of Christ was directly contemplated by Him. "What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt understand hereafter." "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." "These things have I spoken unto you, while yet abiding with you. But the Comforter . . . He shall . . . bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you." A striking illustration is the incident of the feet washing, of which Christ said, "What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt understand hereafter." At the time He explained it as an acted lesson of humility and service. But surely He did not intend that to be the only lesson. "Hereafter,"—*οὐκ οἶδας ἄρτι γνώσῃ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα*—requires a remoter apprecia-

tion. We remember the words ὁ λελουμένος, κ.τ.λ., perhaps little noticed at the time in comparison with the dominant lesson of the moment. The act was a teaching that after the one great bathing from sin—ὁ λελουμένος . . . καὶ ὑμεῖς καθαροί ἐστε ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες—there is continual cleansing, and that in the journey of life the traveller can again and again wash off the dust of the way from the weary feet.

In any consideration of subject matter of the Fourth Gospel it is essential to bear this in mind. It is this characteristic that gives that subject matter its special importance and weight. The writer looks back on the life of Christ in the light of the further teaching of the Holy Spirit. That teaching has cast fresh light on words and deeds—on aspects and bearings of them little noted at the time: He has called them to remembrance. The writer has noted that in the general current knowledge of the life of Christ they are omitted. Yet knowledge of them is essential in his mind to a right appreciation of the other things. Therefore he writes them down. To know the other things—*e.g.*, those recorded in the Synoptists—without them is to be at the top of a ladder, but not to grasp the strength of the rungs; to hold a treasure, but not fully to appreciate its worth; to know and to use a form, but not to realize its fulness. Robert Browning puts this inimitably. He represents S. John as saying that he—

“Patient stated much of the Lord’s life
 Forgotten or misdelivered, and let it work
 Since much that at the first, in deed and word,
 Lay simply and sufficiently exposed,
 Had grown—or else my soul was grown to match,
 Fed through such years, familiar with such light,
Guarded and guided still to see and speak—
 Of new significance and fresh result;
 What first were guessed as points, I now knew stars,
 And named them in the Gospel I have writ.”

Now let us, bearing steadily in mind this general character of S. John's Gospel, turn our attention to the discourse with Nicodemus and the discourses in chapter vi.

The central point of the discourse with Nicodemus in S. John iii. is the conditions of "seeing the kingdom of God." Nicodemus is an enquirer after teaching from God, drawn to seek it from Christ from a sense that His "signs" stamp Him as capable and authorized to give it.

Now we notice that the idea of the phrase "*the kingdom of God*" seems to present no difficulty to Nicodemus. He is evidently familiar with it. And yet to the student of S. John's Gospel it is startling to find it here. It is in this passage only, iii. 3, 5, that it is found in this Gospel. But it evidently filled S. John Baptist's teaching, and it fills the pages of the Synoptists. It was evidently frequently in the mouth of Christ. He expounded fully the nature, laws, character, worth of "*the kingdom of God*." This was so sufficiently known that it was unnecessary for S. John to repeat it. Evidently Nicodemus knew the term and the interpretation thereof. He knew it as Christ's term for that visible, present Church in which He is king, of which the visible kingdom of Israel was a type under the old dispensation. He certainly takes it as signifying the visible, present Church; this is clear from his difficulty, "How can a man be born when he is old?" Had he taken it to signify only a spiritual body or a future perfected, spiritual body of believers, he would have instinctively treated the term "*be born again*" in a spiritual sense; his further words, "*Can he enter,*" etc., show that he did not. His question shows clearly that he took the term "*kingdom of God*" in the general sense in which we have it presented in the Synoptists, as, *e.g.*, in the parable of the wheat and tares as expounded by our Lord. (Here we may notice in passing a striking example of the way in which in S. John "synoptic" knowledge is pre-

supposed as known. The use of this technical term is like a rivet bolting this discourse on to the teaching of John the Baptist, and the whole body of the teaching of Christ on "*the kingdom of God*," so fully treated in the teaching and knowledge represented by the Synoptists.)

But the discourse is on the conditions of "*seeing*"—nay, "*entering into the kingdom*." Our Lord states that it is through a birth *ἄνωθεν*, and then explains *ἄνωθεν* by *ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος*. The two means to the new birth—water and spirit—are so linked together in the phrase, *ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος*, that the idea is conveyed that both are essential. Now here again, from the rest of our Lord's words, we can judge which part of the term required special treatment at the moment. He goes on to speak of the need of the Spirit's action in the process; and by the simile of the wind, gives an idea of the action of the Spirit as of an unseen force, operating according to laws of its own, imperfectly perceived by human capacities. Evidently Nicodemus understood *ἐξ ὕδατος* as he understood *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ*. He needed no explanation of either. The question at once arises, What was that conception of *γεννᾶσθαι ἐξ ὕδατος* which our Lord allowed to pass undisturbed as adequate in this momentous matter?

In answer I quote the Bishop of Durham's note on the passage. "It can scarcely be questioned that as Nicodemus heard the words, *water* carried with it a reference to John's baptism, which was a divinely appointed rite (i. 33), gathering up into itself and investing with a new importance all the lustral baptisms of the Jews; the *Spirit*, on the other hand, marked that inward power which John placed in contrast with his own baptism. Thus the words, taken in their immediate meaning as intelligible to Nicodemus, set forth, as required before entrance into the kingdom of God, the acceptance of the

preliminary rite divinely sanctioned, which was the seal of repentance and so of forgiveness, and following on this the communication of a new life, resulting from the direct action of the Holy Spirit through Christ." Nor can we doubt that in giving this teaching to Nicodemus our Lord's words "look forward to the Christian dispensation when after the resurrection the baptism of water was no longer separated from " (as it was in John's baptism) "but united with the baptism of the Spirit in the 'laver of regeneration' (Titus iii. 5), even as the outward and the inward are united generally in a religion which is sacramental and not only typical."

Thus we see in this discourse that quite early in the ministry Christ contemplated a baptism in water as an outward preliminary to the action of the Spirit in the new birth. And I cannot doubt that in His teaching it recurred, just as it lies beneath the surface in xiii. 10, *ὁ λελουμένος, κ.τ.λ.* By teaching such as this, of which the discourse with Nicodemus forms a representative example, the institution of Holy Baptism had been prepared for. It did not come as a surprise. It fell into its place like a finial on a gable, into a place prepared for it, and to which lines had been converging. If no such Sacrament had been instituted, men would have asked, "How are we to be born—not of the Spirit only, but *ἐξ ὕδατος*?" The whole thing belonged integrally and essentially to the ministerial teaching of Christ. He contemplated it from the first. He instituted it at the right moment. Years afterwards S. John (who speaks of Jesus Christ as *ὁ ἐλθὼν δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος*, 1 John v. 6) notices that in the current accounts of the ministry the lines leading to the institution were falling out of view. They were essential to a full appreciation of the place which it filled in the mind of Christ. The discourse with Nicodemus (perhaps communicated in friendship?) he now perceived to be "a star"

throwing its light forward to it. Thus the section gives us insight into the preparation which led to the institution, and justifies, from the mind and purpose of Christ, the place the Sacrament fills in the Acts and Epistles, and in the life of the Church. We now pass to S. John vi.

Note that the chapter contains no fewer than six clearly marked sections, very clearly seen if the Revised Version is used. It is a grouping of Christ's teaching delivered in different places and times, with its immediate results, focussed by S. John around the one central subject of all—Christ the life of the believer.

These sections are: (i.) vv. 1-15; vv. 16-21, connecting passage (ii.) vv. 22-40. (iii.) vv. 41-51; teaching elicited by § ii., place and time unmentioned. (iv.) vv. 52-59; teaching elicited by § iii., delivered in a Capernaum synagogue, v. 59. (v.) 60-65, immediate effect and teaching elicited thereby. (vi.) subsequent effect of the whole. We are concerned chiefly with §§ i.-iv.

To consider, then, §§ i.-iv. in more detail.

§ i. vv. 1-14. The miracle of feeding the multitude. In this Christ gives the idea of Himself as the sustainer of life—that from an apparently altogether inadequate supply of the commonest food ("barley loaves") He could satisfy the natural hunger of the mass of men. Verse 15, an effect not desired by Christ.

§ ii. vv. 22-40. A discourse in which He gradually raises the minds of the hearers from Himself as the Giver of bodily food to Himself as the universal food from heaven. There is a meat which abideth unto eternal life which the Son of man [note the term of His humanity] is authorized to give; the true bread out of heaven; the "bread of God." This progressive teaching culminates in "*I am the bread of life*," which affords lasting satisfaction of hunger and thirst.

§ iii. vv. 41-51. The discourse represented by these

verses was spoken, I believe, on another occasion and at an unrecorded place. I think the dramatic form of the chapter as a whole suggests it, and it marks such an advance in the instruction that I feel it naturally follows at some interval. As v. 52 represents an effect which gradually made itself felt, as we see from v. 59, so v. 41 seems to give the effect of § ii. as hearers gradually weighed and appreciated its import. The "murmurs" lead to a measured warning, and reiteration (vv. 48-50) of the revelation of Himself as "*the bread of life*". . . *which cometh down out of heaven that a man may eat thereof and not die.*" But then He goes further: this bread has "*life*" as an essential property—"I am the living bread" (ὁ ἄπτος ὁ ζῶν, therefore ὁ ἄπτος τῆς ζωῆς); and "the bread which I will give is *My flesh*." Observe how the terms have become increasingly precise. "*Meat*," "*the true bread out of heaven*," "*I*," "*bread of life*," "*living bread*," "*My flesh*." Two points in particular show the advance in precision: (1) the term "*bread out of heaven*" in our Lord's mouth is drawn from the words of His hearers, and "*out of heaven*" is kept by Him only so long as it rightly belongs to the increasing clearness of teaching. "*Out of heaven*" is dropped when "*My flesh*" is used: He does not speak of "*My flesh out of heaven*" or "*which came down out of heaven*." (2) "*My flesh*" is a more precise term than "*I*" in the mouth of our Lord; it is the "*I*" incarnate. The introduction of the term "*My flesh*" calls for special notice. We can hardly separate it in meaning from the meaning it bears in i. 14. It here comes on the lips of Christ for the first time, and His use of it is recorded only in these discourses. It is a highly technical term, which was (v. 52), and must have been to His hearers at the time, altogether unintelligible. It needed such light as that of Hebrews x. 5, the realization of the value of the humanity of Christ, and of the virtue of that humanity

imparted to His members, to interpret it. It was verily a seed—a kernel. It needed indeed a patient and humble faith to hear this. It was fixed on at once by “*the Jews*” for question.

§ iv. vv. 52–59, delivered in a Capernaum synagogue (59). This teaching was called out by the contentious questioning of His unbelieving opponents, “*the Jews*”—“*How can this man give us His flesh to eat?*” How? How? The point of the question echoes on as we read vv. 53–58, in which Christ deals with the questioners (in the same spirit as that described, e.g., Mark iv. 11, 12; Matt. xiii. 11 *sqq.*), but does not answer the question. As we read the verses (53–58) we note the continuous advance in precision of teaching. Now we hear of “*eating the flesh of the Son of man and drinking His blood.*” As being “*meat indeed and drink indeed*” it brings “*a raising up at the last day.*” Such partaking brings a continuous union of life. “*He . . . abideth in Me and I in him*” (note this). The whole culminates in the law laid down (v. 57) καθὼς ἀπέστειλέν με ὁ ζῶν πατήρ καὶ γὰρ ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα καὶ ὁ τρώγων με καὶ ἐμὸς ζήσεται δι’ ἐμέ. And v. 58 marks this as the point to which all the teaching previously recorded had converged. But the πῶς δύναται οὗτος, κ.τ.λ., is not given. The exact question stands unanswered, though its importance is more clearly shown. “*My time is not yet come*” is writ on vv. 53–58.

Nor did He forthwith, in the two scenes, evidently separate, portrayed in § v. vv. 60–65, § vi. vv. 66 to end, expound these terms, or the “*πῶς*” to the disciples, weak (§ v.) or strong (§ vi.) in faith. In the very spirit breathed in S. Matthew xiii. 11 *sqq.* they are left to work like leaven—to grow like seed. It is the principle ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν (Rom. i. 17) at work.

But when we remember Mark iv. 34 (N.B.—πάντα) and Matthew xiii. 11, “*To you it hath been given to know τὰ*

μυστήρια," we can scarcely doubt that He gave subsequently to the Twelve such an exposition of the terms used as was possible for them to receive and assimilate duly before the death on the cross and the gift of the light of the Spirit to lead them into all truth.

Here I wish to note three things :

1. The teaching of Christ given in the chapter forms a very substantial part of S. John's account of our Lord's public ministry. It is one of his few large chapters of it. In mere bulk it forms about one-eighth of his total record of it.

2. This use of terms for "*life*" and its sustenance, borrowed from the terms of sustaining the natural life by Christ, is not limited to this remarkable series of instruction. In S. John iv. we read of His speaking to the woman of *drinking water which springs to eternal life*, but when she asks for it, He turned off the point of the conversation. His time had not then come. Later, He spoke to the disciples of "*meat to eat that they knew not of.*" This in Samaria some time before. Later again, vii. 37, He cried : "*If any man thirst, let him come unto Me and drink,*" and so be a source of refreshment to others—words evidently, from the note vii. 39, not understood at the time nor explained. Note also that vi. 56 is, as it were, the seed out of which xv. 1-8, xvii. 21 grows. So that it is, I think, clear that all through the ministry Christ used to speak of the sustaining of the spiritual life under the terms of "*eating,*" "*drinking*" "*food,*" "*meat,*" and the like.

3. This "*vocabulary*" of our Lord has no place whatever in the synoptic record of His teaching. Just as S. John records southern ministries not fully treated in the Synoptists, and a general style of speaking and vocabulary represented in the Synoptists only by S. Matthew xi. 27, Luke x. 22, so here we have a "*particular vocabulary*" recorded by S. John, the absence of which, in the Syn-

optists, is the absence of the path of phrase, teaching and idea leading to the institution of the Holy Communion.

We noted that the question : “ *How can this man give us His flesh to eat ?* ” was unanswered at the moment. But now, with our thoughts fresh, let the reader read the record of the institution of the Holy Communion in the Synoptists. The passages we have considered in S. John show that in the institution He used terms not strange to the Apostles, and ideas long broached. When He took bread, gave thanks, brake, and gave—when He said, “ *This is My body which is being broken for you,* ” “ *this is My blood of the covenant which is shed for many,* ” surely their thoughts went back to the scene when He took the loaves, gave thanks, brake, distributed, and to the teaching which flowed from the act. They must have felt instinctively that He was then answering the question $\pi\omega\varsigma$, $\kappa.\tau.\lambda.$ There was the same use of common means of life ; the same significant action ; the same idea ; terms of the same nature as those then used. Their patient trust had received the answer denied to the impatient and curious. “ Tarry thou the LORD’s leisure : . . . and He shall comfort thine heart.”

Thus S. John vi. stands in exactly the same relation to the institution of the Holy Communion that chapter iii. stands to the institution of Holy Baptism. To my mind it is recorded and arranged as it is by the writer to justify importance attached to that Sacrament which might seem, perhaps, disproportionate to the place its purpose filled in the mind of Christ to those knowing and using only records of the Synoptic character or the Synoptists, or definitely to interpret the Sacrament. Reading vi. 53, it would be strange if our Lord left the question of v. 52 unanswered. *If the Holy Communion is not the answer, what is ?* If it is, with v. 53 before us, the strong words of the Catechism are not too strong. It is ordained by Christ as “ *generally*

necessary to salvation," for those who regard "*salvation*" as a sustained life in Christ.

These two passages of S. John's Gospel seem, therefore, to be related to the institution of the two Sacraments thus—they give an account of preliminary training on Christ's part to secure that when the institution came it should fall on minds ready to receive it, and trained to perceive the cardinal importance and purpose of each. They justify the importance attached to them by the Church on the substantial ground of the mind of Christ. And such a view falls in entirely with the general character of the Fourth Gospel.

H. J. C. KNIGHT.

THE APPEARANCES OF THE RISEN LORD TO INDIVIDUALS.

ST. MARK XVI. 9.—"Now when He was risen early on the first day of the week, He appeared first to Mary Magdalene."

I COR. XV. 5, 7, 8.—"He appeared to Cephas . . . then He appeared to James . . . and last of all, as unto one born out of due time, He appeared to me also."

IN Paley's *View of the Evidences of Christianity* that acute reasoner institutes a comparison between the evidence for Christianity that is based on miracles and similar evidence which, he says, "our adversaries may bring into comparison with ours." He divides the distinctions between Christian miracles and other alleged evidential miracles into two kinds: those which relate to the proof, and those which relate to the miracles themselves. Speaking of the latter class, Paley lays down, in the first place, that "it is not necessary to admit as a miracle what can be resolved into a false perception; of this nature was the demon of Socrates, the visions of St. Anthony and of many others.

. . . All these may be accounted for by a momentary insanity; for the characteristic symptom of human madness is the rising up in the mind of images not distinguishable by the patient from impressions upon the senses. . . . They are, for the most part, cases of visions or voices; the object is hardly ever touched. . . . They are likewise almost always cases of a solitary witness." So far Paley. Such miracles as these, it is needless to say, can prove nothing except to the percipient, and Paley has no difficulty in showing that the gospel miracles are not of this class. Yet is it not a striking fact that out of the ten or eleven recorded appearances of the risen Lord, no fewer than four should have been, to use Paley's phrase, "cases of a solitary witness," miracles, that is, which an adversary of Christianity might "resolve into a false perception"? It is no doubt true that other self-manifestations of Christ after His resurrection were of a nature to satisfy the most exacting inquirer; but it is tolerably certain that antecedently a Christian believer would have preferred that all the post-resurrection appearances of Christ should have been of this convincing kind, and a Christian apologist might be excused for regarding these four appearances to solitary individuals as possible difficulties and certainly useless as evidence. A more careful consideration, however, may perhaps lead us to the conviction that such a view is based on a misapprehension as to what the evidence for Christianity really is, inasmuch as these four "cases of a solitary witness" have probably brought conviction to more minds even than the manifestations in which the sacred Body was handled, and seen to eat and drink by a number of persons.

First, let us observe that the particular individuals to whom the Lord thus vouchsafed to reveal Himself were themselves examples of four types of sainthood which have built up the Church in all ages—types which often misunderstand and undervalue each other, but which are all necessary to the

completeness of the Church's holiness—Mary, the woman of utter devotion and self-forgetful service; Peter, the practical organizer, with imagination and sympathies, it may be, necessarily and providentially restricted; James, the man of prayer, meditation, and rigid self-discipline, the man of inactive piety, as some might call him; and lastly, Paul, who was something of all three preceding types, but who was besides a man of the world, in the best sense, and one who by his training could bring the gospel message into relation with the best ethical teaching and culture of his day, and who from his broad sympathies could interpret the gospel to men of every class of mind.

In the next place, we note a remarkable circumstance about these appearances, what Paley would call an example of "the candour of the writers of the New Testament," what we might regard as a damaging admission—the fact that so little is told us about them. St. Jerome, indeed, has preserved an interesting story, from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, about the appearance of the Lord to St. James, but beyond the bare fact we read nothing in the canonical Scriptures about the manifestation to him or to St. Peter. "Something sealed the lips of those evangelists." And, moreover, the Lord would seem to have deliberately provided against the possibility of these appearances being used as demonstrative proofs of the reality of His resurrection. Whatever may have been the full meaning of the words "Touch Me not," spoken to Mary, they certainly stand in striking contrast to the invitation, "Handle Me, and see," addressed to the disciples later on. In like manner the highest degree of certainty, as it is commonly understood, was not granted to St. Paul. He saw the Lord. He did not touch Him. Nor was touch necessary. The personal appeal, "Mary," "Saul, Saul," brought home to the minds and souls of those addressed a conviction that nothing else could give. Listen to the immediate response, "Rabboni,"

"Who art Thou, Lord?"—the last lingering trace of scepticism, and the first confession of faith, at a breath. How wonderful is the magic of a personal address! What language can adequately express the emotions that vibrate through our whole being at the sound of our own name, uttered in the great crises of life by one whom the love of years has made part of ourselves! All the past of us that they have known—its weaknesses and follies, its joys and sorrows, its temptations yielded to and resisted—all seems to echo in the intonation with which is sounded our own name, that word in which our personality is expressed and summed up.

But though the revelation of the risen Lord to these four persons is not known to us in its fulness, or at all, yet we may fairly suppose that it was in *every* case a conversion. It was a correction of past faults or misapprehensions, and a consecration for the future service of the Master of the special gifts of each one. The love and devotion of Mary Magdalene, complete though it was in self-surrender, needed elevating and spiritualizing. The dear, dead Body of the revered Teacher was everything to her. She it was that took the lead in the procuring of spices to anoint it. She weeps "because they have taken away my Lord out of the sepulchre, and I know not where they have laid Him." She pleads with the supposed gardener, "Sir, if thou have borne Him hence, tell me where thou hast laid Him, and I will take Him away." Words these, indeed, of love that can do all things, but which need correction by a deeper knowledge of who her Lord really is. And so she who comes to tend lovingly a dead body must needs be charged with the duty of proclaiming the Ascension. Again, it is at least conceivable that Peter's fall arose in part from his practical temperament, as yet undisciplined. It was not cowardice only that caused Peter to deny his Master, but also hopelessness about a lost cause. He was a man

of action. He would do anything—smite with the sword, but it must be, if not for a successful, at least for an active leader. Can we doubt that, in his first meeting with the Conqueror over death, Peter, besides receiving the assurance of full forgiveness, learnt something of the nature of true success? With respect to James, we cannot speak with certainty. St. John, writing of a time in the ministry of Christ not long before the Passion, says, “Even His brethren did not believe on Him.” It may be that James had had narrow Essene prejudices against the Messianic ideal as portrayed by our Lord. In any case, it was from the resurrection life that he drew the broader, more kindly, and sympathetic spirit which breathes in his words at the apostolic council. It is unnecessary to enlarge on the corrective and consecrating significance of the manifestation of the Lord to Saul of Tarsus.

We have now seen that in the wisdom of God it was provided that to four distinct types of character the risen Lord specially revealed Himself in a manner that was personal, incommunicable, ineffable, corrective and consecrating. Let us, in the last place, note that these appearances, which apparently could not be verified, were, from the very first, powerful in bringing home conviction to others. When the two disciples returned from Emmaus to Jerusalem, the first words that greeted them were not “We have seen the Lord,” but “The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon.” And thousands in the apostolic age must have realized for themselves the last beatitude, “Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.” What numbers must have been converted by the unsupported testimony of St. Paul alone! In some of the Churches the more reflecting of his converts might indeed have had their faith confirmed by the fact that those who opposed his apostolic claims yet were at one with him as to the resurrection of Christ; but if human nature was then what it is now, this

corroboration must have had little practical effect. Beliefs that are held in common by different sections of a religion are held by one section rather in spite of than because of the other's belief in them. And sometimes, when party spirit runs high, the strain becomes too great, and a portion of the original common inheritance is dropped by one section or the other.

What then was it that persuaded these people of the truth of a miracle the evidence for which was not, strictly speaking, satisfactory? It was what we may venture to call an intuitive conviction, based on the realized presence with them and in them of a perfectly new force, "a power of God working unto salvation." St. Paul, and every other preacher of the gospel, came fresh and eager into a worn-out, effete society, came like a life-giving breath of God into a dead world. They came charged, as it were, with a new vitalizing power. Men saw it in their persons; it glowed in their faces; it thrilled their hearers when they spoke.

The man who passes from the dingy and used-up atmosphere of a great city up to the heights where the sun shines and the breezes blow does not need scientific proof that he is now breathing a more wholesome air. He knows it. "When all the sons of God shouted for joy," it was not because they heard God say, "Let there be light," but because "there was light," and because, as they gazed, creative order was visibly taking the place of chaos.

And so, too, when the new creative force came into the world of human society, originating from the resurrection of Christ as its source, diffused by the Pentecostal gifts of the Holy Ghost, those who had the "honest and good heart" to receive it did not need, and did not demand, a judicial investigation to prove that Christ had risen, seeing that they felt by personal experience that they themselves were living members of His body, with His life coursing

through their veins. So it has always been, and always will be. On the one hand, "if they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." The evidence does not exist, and cannot be produced, that will convince a man against his will; and, on the other hand, those who hear Moses and the prophets, those, that is, who have had awakened in them a sense of sin and feel a need of a Saviour and a Redeemer, do not need overmastering proof that He whom they know to be their Saviour has risen from the dead. They are in a living relation to Him. It would scarcely be going too far to say that the primary object of the resurrection of Christ was not to supply a miraculous proof of the revelation He taught, but rather to be the means of saving the souls of men directly, as being itself the source of the power of the Gospel.

The new life that flowed from the resurrection of Christ is with us here and now; and men are not made Christians or confirmed in their Christianity by evidence legally or scientifically satisfactory, but by contact with the personal life of the Saviour—a contact effected instrumentally in the sacraments, which derive their force from His risen life. But though the seed of Divine life may be sown in a heart unconscious of its reception, yet the sacred germ must be afterwards cultivated and cherished by the conscious action of the receiver of the grace of life. This is the precious and eternal truth of mysticism. Our personal God does deal directly with the personal and individual soul. "Blessed is that soul which hears the Lord speaking within her, and from His mouth receives the word of consolation." This, of course, is evidence only to the man who hears the Divine voice. It will not persuade others. To the individual, however, nothing can speak with a more authoritative voice than his intuitions. Faith, if it desires to justify itself to others, must seek an intellectual basis, and

Christian faith is well able to do this. Yet, if it does not do so, it is not less quick to good, nor less powerful to influence life.

Once more, this personal experience and appropriation of the resurrection life of Christ is, so far as it relates to ourselves, incommunicable and ineffable. If it be true that "the heart knoweth its own bitterness," it is no less true that "a stranger doth not intermeddle with its joy." "For who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man which is in him?" Vain is the attempt to translate supreme experiences into words. It is indeed this impossibility to communicate to others, in its fullness, what we feel that makes human life and each new human personality ever fresh and interesting. Much as we may have read about them, the great joys and sorrows of life, natural or spiritual, are when they come as surprising and new to each of us as they were to Adam. Nor is it necessary to the spreading of the faith, or to the building up and strengthening of the faithful, that Christians should even attempt to narrate their experiences. When St. Paul told the Corinthians, "Ye are our epistle written in our hearts, known and read of all men," he was certainly referring, not to the language of the converts about themselves, but to their daily walk and conversation. Analysis of religious emotions is to be declared "secretly among the faithful" rather than "in the congregation." It was not the world in general, but those that fear God, whom the psalmist invited to hearken to what the Lord had done for his soul. The words of religious men are not always fairly estimated by the unconverted. In any case it is not by words that the world is won for Christ, but by the presence in it of lives changed by the power of His resurrection; not always world-famous lives, such as that of Saul the persecutor, Augustine the libertine, Francis the spendthrift, or Newton the slave dealer, but more often the

lives of those who have no scope beyond the daily round and the common task. When men see the impure become chaste, the drunkard temperate, the naturally arrogant humble, the hot-tempered gentle, the dishonest upright, then they marvel and take knowledge of them that they have been with Jesus.

NEWPORT J. D. WHITE.

*SURVEY OF RECENT ENGLISH LITERATURE
ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.*

INTRODUCTION. — By the issue of a fifth “fasciculus,” Bishop Wordsworth and Mr. White complete the first volume, containing the Gospels, of their standard edition of the Vulgate.¹ The part now issued contains what the editors call an “Epilogue,” which is really an introduction, but an introduction written with the experience and knowledge accumulated in course of editing the work. It deals with the precise object Jerome had in view in preparing the Vulgate, the character of the Greek MSS. he used, the history of the text both written and printed. The editors show that it was not Jerome’s object to write a wholly new translation from the Greek, but rather to compare the various Latin versions already in existence and make such use of them as he considered most consistent with regard to the original. It is obvious, therefore, that with care a critic may ascertain, with the help of the Vulgate, the character of the Greek text which in Jerome’s days was most approved. This line of enquiry is pursued by the present editors with their usual scholarship, acuteness and judgment. Two types of readings were, they find, under Jerome’s eye, the one differing from all MSS. now extant, the other agreeing with the group *ŒBL*. The Latin Vulgate texts, again, they divide into three classes, of which the highest comprises the MSS. which are the most ancient and unadulterated. It is remarkable that although these, as was to be expected, were

¹ *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi Latine secundum editionem Sancti Hieronymi recensuit J. Wordsworth, S.T.P., H. J. White, A.M.; Oxonię Typog. Clarendon.*

Italian in their origin, it is rather to Milan, Capua, and Naples we owe them than to Rome. Besides a thoroughly scientific sifting of the Codices, the editors furnish also several statistical tables which enable the reader to some extent to check their statements. They further give an account of the rules which governed them in their application of the commonly received critical principles; while a copious index of Latin words, with the Greek they represent, completes a work creditable to English scholarship. For the editors have produced not only the authoritative edition of the Vulgate [Gospels] but at the same time an extremely valuable contribution to Textual Criticism.

Any one who aims at making a thorough study of the New Testament is very soon compelled to long for a satisfactory Greek text, or at any rate for the material out of which such a text can be formed. In the main the text of Tischendorf or of Westcott and Hort is sufficiently acceptable, but we cannot tell how far we should follow either until the authorities out of which it is formed are under our eyes. For the purpose of exhibiting these authorities Tischendorf's larger eighth edition is perfect for the library, while Westcott and Hort's second volume affords an excellent training in the use of these authorities. But Tischendorf is too bulky, and Westcott and Hort is not complete. Prof. Sanday's Appendix to the Oxford Greek Testament gives a selection of the more important readings, with the authorities for them, and is a work of judgment and accuracy. But what is wanted is a text with an accompanying digest of all various readings together with the authorities. The Dutch scholar, Baljon, perceiving this want, has aimed at supplying it in his *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Groningen), which is now completed. Of course he is largely indebted to Tischendorf: indeed a considerable part of the notes is identical with the older editor's "Editio critica minor." He does not always accept Tischendorf's text, nor does he agree with the English editors. In common with many others, he is of opinion that the German critic was too much influenced by his own discovery, the Sinaitic MS., while W.-H. too implicitly trusted the Vatican. Baljon himself, although recognising the vast importance of this MS., also bears in mind that even the best MS. is faulty and removed by three or four centuries from the autograph. He therefore admits a good deal of conjectural emendation. It will therefore be understood that the text thus

produced will or will not be approved according as the reader's subjective judgment or taste happens to coincide with the editor's. The text is printed in a small but clear type, and the notes, which are solely critical, occupy the lower half of the page and are easily legible. The form of the book is convenient, a small octavo; and although not perhaps ideally perfect, this Greek Testament may provisionally be cordially recommended.

From the Delegates and Syndics of the Oxford and Cambridge University Presses we have received *The Holy Bible* in the Revised Version *With References*. These have been prepared with the greatest care by men in whom the public has confidence. They took as a basis for their work the marginal references in the Authorised Version and those in Dr. Scrivener's paragraph Bible. But these have been verified, revised and augmented by skilled Biblical scholars. The system of signs is excellent, the modes of indication being simple and sufficient. In previous editions of the Revised Version the numbers of the verses were placed on the margin of each page: they are now placed at the beginning of each verse, which is certainly more convenient for reference. The chapters are also indicated in a bold, black, obtrusive type, so that everything conduces to the ease of finding any passage. In every respect this is a most satisfactory edition.

Prof. Richard G. Moulton, of Chicago, continues the issue of his *Modern Reader's Bible* (The Macmillan Co.). The New Testament is now complete, and both the arrangement and the notes undoubtedly help the reader to understand the sequence and the significance of the text. Mr. Howard Swan also continues to issue *The Voice of the Spirit* (Sampson Low, Marston & Co.). It will be remembered that this is an attempt to translate the Bible, idea for idea, into modern style. Book iv. contains *Matthew* and *Galatians*.

A most valuable contribution to the study of the Synoptic Problem has been made by the Rev. Sir John C. Hawkins, Bart., M.A., in his *Horae Synopticae* (Clarendon Press). He disclaims the intention of presenting a solution of the problem. This he may attempt at some future time. At present he restricts himself to the necessary task of gathering material from the Gospels themselves which may be found to contribute to the ultimate solution. He is of opinion that from a careful examination of the language of the Gospels certain conclusions are inevitable; and

this opinion he justifies by the full lists of peculiarities and tables of comparison with which in this volume he furnishes the student. Even as a study of the linguistic characteristics of the Synoptists the book is of great value. Apart altogether from the use which may be made of the material here gathered for the solution of the Synoptic problem, this volume presents a more complete comparative analysis of the language of the Synoptists than can be found elsewhere. One really becomes once more hopeful of the ultimate solution of the problem, when it becomes apparent that patient and self-restrained zeal, scholarly aptitude and sanity of judgment, such as are manifest in this book, are enlisted in the work.

Another volume devoted to the same problem cannot be pronounced so successful. It aims higher and accomplishes much less. Mr. Joseph Palmer, in his *Gospel Problems and their Solution* (Allenson), believes that he has found the key or keys which unlock all the hitherto closed doors. His Master Key is that "the narrative parts of the Gospels were written soon after, and for the most part immediately after, the events happened which they relate; and that the reports of Christ's longer addresses were taken down as they were spoken." Mr. Palmer further holds that our Lord spoke both Aramaic and Greek, and that His utterances in Aramaic are mostly contained in the Synoptists, while His Greek discourses are to be found in John. These propositions so completely traverse the results of criticism that many readers will be tempted to throw Mr. Palmer's volume aside as a mere eccentricity. This, however, will be to their loss. For the book contains much that should be considered.

The second "Livraison" of the first part of Godet's *Introduction au Nouveau Testament* (Neuchâtel, Attinger Frères) has appeared. It contains 200 pages on the Gospel of St. Matthew.

The esteemed American scholar, Prof. De Witt Burton, of Chicago, has reprinted from the *American Journal of Theology* his exhaustive and valuable article on *The Politarchs in Macedonia and Elsewhere*. This paper gathers together all available information on the subject and brings up to date this fragment of New Testament knowledge.

The Rev. A. Welch, in *The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier), advocates the view that St. Peter was the author—a view not likely to be accepted. In

the other papers contained in the volume the Melchizedek priesthood, the Descent into Hades, and other subjects are treated with some suggestiveness.

Dr. Briggs, of Union Theological Seminary, has certainly conferred a boon upon students of the New Testament by reissuing his *Biblical Study* in a thoroughly revised and greatly enlarged form under the title *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture* (T. & T. Clark). The learned and industrious author has gathered into his massive volume a vast amount of information on the languages, the text, the canon, the history, and the interpretation of the sacred writings both of the Old and New Testaments. It is exactly the suitable text book for any one who is in want of an accurate survey of the whole field of Introduction.

Messrs. Macmillan & Co., Ltd., have done a good work in issuing a translation, by Mr. Henry St. John Thackeray, of Prof. Blass' *Grammar of New Testament Greek*. The great reputation of the author as a Greek scholar and his well-known enthusiasm in New Testament studies will carry this book into popular use. And it deserves cordial welcome. It is full, yet compressed; it is not a mere echo of other Grammars, but is marked by originality and independence; it is also thoroughly up to date. That it is better than those already in the field need not be absolutely affirmed. The distinctive characteristic on which the author lays chief stress is that MSS. are referred to rather than editions. But that which will win for it general acceptance is its fulness and convenience of arrangement. The translation could not be improved.

Prof. W. M. Ramsay's answer to the question *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?* (Hodder & Stoughton) has already made itself so well known that it is too late to commend it to public attention. The critical predictions or surmises to which he had been led by sagacious deduction from extant material were remarkably verified by discoveries brought to light after the publication of his volume. The net result of his book is a further assurance of the credibility of St. Luke, and the probability that our Lord's birth took place in 6 B.C. The volume contains much excellent matter tending to the elucidation of the history of the period and to the placing of historical criticism on a surer basis. Prof. Ramsay's volume is a solid contribution which at once takes its place in the structure of New Testament criticism.

Prof. Potwin, of Adelbert College, U.S.A., has collected a number of exegetical studies and has published them under the title, *Here and There in the Greek New Testament* (Allenson, London). To those who have given some attention to the New Testament vocabulary, Prof. Potwin is known as a diligent and intelligent collector of statistics, whose labours have been used freely by less industrious scholars. In the papers now published he gives evidence that he is able to make effective use of his own material, and by applying his linguistic knowledge to some contested passages of the New Testament, he makes a distinct contribution to their happier interpretation. There is also much to be learned from his notes on words borrowed from the Latin, the Hebrew and the Aramaic. The volume is introduced by a paper under the title, "Hints on New Testament Exegesis," in which there is much that is at once wise and practical. It is to be hoped that Prof. Potwin's volume will be widely read on this side of the Atlantic.

The importance of Aramaic for the study of the Gospels is now generally recognised, and it is gratifying that so many scholars are turning their attention in this direction. Among these, Mr. Stanley A. Cook occupies a distinguished place, and some of the fruits of his investigations are published by the Cambridge University Press in *A Glossary of the Aramaic Inscriptions*. This volume cannot but advance the knowledge of the language. Especial care has been bestowed upon the proper names which occur in the Inscriptions, and the dates have also been carefully registered.

Some minor books which belong to the department of Introduction should also be noticed, such as *Bible Manners and Customs*, a contribution to the Guild Library of the Church of Scotland, by Rev. G. M. Mackie, whose name is well known by his articles in the new Bible Dictionary, and who is qualified for his work by a long residence in the East.—Mr. Cecil Torr publishes a brief note on *Portraits of Christ in the British Museum* (Cambridge Univ. Press). These portraits represent Christ as very young, and Mr. Torr suggests an ingenious theory regarding the date of Christ's birth.

A large and handsome volume by Dr. Kuyper, the powerful advocate of orthodoxy in the Netherlands, has been published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton. The title is probably not attractive

to English readers, as *Encyclopædia of Sacred Theology* is too elaborate a study and too far removed from life to win practical men. But although parts of this volume may repel by their theoretic and formal character, it yet contains an important discussion of revelation and inspiration. In his treatment of these hackneyed themes, Dr. Kuyper proves that it is possible to be at once conservative and original. Certainly no one will read these chapters without receiving new ideas and fresh light. Were there nothing more in the volume, it would still deserve the strongly recommendatory notice which Dr. Warfield prefixes to the translation.

MARCUS DODS.

*THE "MYSTICAL" AND "SACRAMENTAL"
TEMPERAMENTS.*

THERE is a well-known remark of Coleridge to the effect that every man is born either a Platonist or an Aristotelian. And if we take these two terms as implying a difference, not of philosophy but of mental temperament, the distinction is exceedingly true. Plato, the great idealist, stands for all time as the accepted type of that class of mind which draws its knowledge from within—the introspective, intuitional, contemplative type, which, in its extreme form, becomes the mystic, dwelling with closed eyes upon the inner vision. Aristotle, on the other hand, is the great observer, the philosopher of experience, the student of detail, whether in physics or politics, society or art—the type, in a word, of all who draw their knowledge primarily from without—the parent, if at a long distance, of experimental science. These two methods are complementary and not mutually exclusive; both alike are present in all master minds. Plato himself could be at times a close and humorous observer, and Aristotle was a profound metaphysician. But as long as two worlds are before us—a world of thought and a world of things—there will always be an instinctive bias, a dominating tendency, either toward the inward or the outward life. We see the fact writ large upon the history of the world, as, for example, in the broad distinction between the Oriental and the Western mind; or, again, within the compass of a single nation in contrasts like that of the Dorian to the Ionian mood; while in our personal experience, however limited, we can

hardly fail to have met with men who were plainly born to think; born mystics or philosophers, and others who were as obviously born to see and feel, born to be in their measure men of science or of art. The distinction does not turn upon the subject-matter with which men deal, the objects of their interest, the occupations of their life, but upon the mental idiosyncrasy, the tone and temper with which they instinctively approach these things.

Now there is no department of life or thought in which this contrast is more clearly apparent than in religion. In all the great religions of the world we meet with two types of mind—one which feels the Divine presence mainly in the inner movements of the soul, and in order for its fuller fruition flies from the scenes of sense, the dweller in forests or in deserts, the ascetic, the mystic, the recluse; the other, which sees God more clearly in the visible creation, the order and the beauty and the wonder of the world, and worships Him in consequence with sacrament and symbol, solemn ceremonial and artistic rite. Sometimes, as in the Vedas, the two feelings are co-ordinate: sometimes one or the other gives a creed its predominant note. The Greek, for instance, with his temples and images, his ritual processions, his music and song, was struck by the subjectivity of the Persian cult; and the Roman felt a similar contrast between himself and the Teutons of the North, without temples, without statues, without pomp or circumstance of worship. But even when this is the case, we are sure to find, upon inspection, that both elements of humanity are present in every national religion. They may blend and intermingle, and give rise, in particular cases, to endless variations of personal practice and belief; but in themselves they remain distinct and distinguishable factors in the fashioning of human character, and therefore also of human creed.

But anything which is a general characteristic of religion

will naturally be found in Christianity. For we have come to realize of late years, with increasing clearness, how profoundly Christianity is the universal, the Catholic, religion,—as gathering up into itself and investing with a deeper meaning and a higher sanction all the elements of truth in antecedent creeds. "What is now called the Christian religion," says St. Augustine in a well-known passage, "existed among the ancients, from the beginning of human history till the day when Christ came in the flesh; and then the true religion, which had always been in the world, first began to be designated Christian." Accordingly we find that Jesus Christ Himself gives express recognition to both the aspects of religious life that we have described. "God is a Spirit," He says, "and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth"; and again, "the kingdom of God is within you"; "blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God"; while, on the other hand, He taught by parables, and used symbolic action and instituted sacraments with the necessary consequence of that external worship which sacraments involve. Not, of course, that in His teaching the two things were presented as separate, nor that they ever need be separate, when considered in themselves; for no religion can be too spiritual to express itself in external acts of worship; while external worship would, of course, be unreal without a spiritual core. But human nature, as we know it, will always have a bias, a tendency to emphasize one of the two elements in question rather than the other. And we soon notice this in the history of the Church. The Tübingen School indeed exaggerated the hostility of Petrine and Pauline Christianity, and seriously misread the Christian documents in consequence; but a distinction undoubtedly existed, by whatever name we call it, between those who laid stress upon the independence of the new spiritual life, its independence of times and

seasons and ordinances of the law, and those who felt its continuity with the older order, and loved to see it clothed in the ancient forms. And the course which Christian history thenceforth pursued was the resultant of these two forces; their mutual influence and interaction, their opposition and reconciliation, colouring and shaping the subsequent development of the Church. Both tendencies, of course, were present in all normal Christian life, but their stress and strain and emphasis were indefinitely varied, with a corresponding variety in the schools of thought and shades of opinion and modes of practice to which their perpetual play and counterplay gave rise. And what happened in the early Church has inevitably happened in all after ages. It is a familiar commonplace that the external side, the material aspect, of religion, was exaggerated in the Middle Ages till it threatened to destroy all spiritual life; and yet, when we look below the surface, the spiritual element was there. Not only were there hermits and monks and recluses, living in inward as well as outward detachment from the world, but even among the sacerdotalists, the militant ecclesiastics, the political Churchmen, the spirit of St. Bernard was by no means rare—Bernard, who once, we are told, journeyed the live-long day beside Lake Leman, and asked in the evening where was the lake, soul and sense alike absorbed in the unseen.

Then, at a later period, came the national groups of mystics, notably the Spanish, the German, and the French. Their attitude towards the externals of religion varied with the characteristics of their race; St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross, for instance, being far stronger sacramentalists than Eckhart or Tauler; but all emphasized the importance of the interior, the contemplative life; while the German school led on to Luther, justification by faith, and the Reformation. The Reformation, again, in its

obvious aspect, was a movement towards spiritual freedom, a reassertion of man's capacity for immediate intercourse with God ; yet within its compass our two tendencies soon reappear, and sacraments and discipline assume as much controversial importance as the independence of the individual soul.

In a word, wherever we look, through the length and breadth of Christian history, we find an antithesis between two temperaments, or tendencies, or types, which, for want of better names, may be called the mystic and the sacramental. The two may at times coalesce, though not without an emphasis on one or the other ; while, on the other hand, at times, they are sharply, decisively divided. The peculiarities of a race, or the circumstances of an age, raise now the one and now the other to ascendancy. But both alike are human, fundamentally and radically human, ingrained in the very make and constitution of man, and the permanent suppression of either would be a psychological impossibility.

These considerations have an obvious bearing upon present controversy in the Church of England. For these two tendencies have always existed in the Church of England as elsewhere. But they are commonly described by various names, derived from the accidents of history—names which arouse prejudice and connote partizanship. And this fact has, unfortunately, tended to obscure in many minds the real nature of the distinction which they imply. For it is a distinction, as we have seen, that goes down to the roots of human character. No historic situation, no prejudice of party, no political or legal action, either created it or can annul it ; its origin is older and its sway more permanent than all these things, and wherever religion is active it is bound to reappear. There will always be those within the Church of England, by whatever name we call them, who empha-

size the soul's immediate intercourse with God in a way and degree that makes all outward mediation, whether of priest or sacrament, a secondary thing,—a symbol, at the utmost, not a factor of the spiritual life. And, on the other hand, there will be those who think more highly of the realm of matter; they feel its importance in their moral experience; they know its reality as a scientific fact; and their religion must find issue in material expression before it can be regarded as in any sense complete. Life must for such have its external rules of discipline; sacraments be duly, ceremonially observed; and penitence poured forth, in human hearing, that pardon may be emphasized by human lips; while between these two extremes there will be countless degrees of combination, but still with one or other for a dominant note.

To say this, is not to imply that the majority of people could state their religious position in philosophical terms, or even recognise its statement philosophically expressed. On the contrary, they would, as a rule, attribute it to secondary causes rather than to its true psychological source. For the same reason they may tolerate, but cannot fairly estimate, modes of thought and practice which are alien to their own, for the simple reason that these rest upon wholly different first principles from those which they themselves, albeit unconsciously, assume. But this only makes it the more needful to keep first principles in view. For when disputes arise over points of detail, such as are at present in the air, it is important to distinguish what is accidental, and can be altered or abolished by authority, from what is ingrained in human nature, and cannot therefore be annulled, with a view to clearing public opinion upon the point. For though public opinion has neither legislative nor judicial authority in ecclesiastical disputes, it is an important factor both in their occurrence and in their ultimate solution. In saying

this, however, one must distinguish between two totally different things, which are often confused under the common name of public opinion. There is the opinion of those who, without caring for religion, or even knowing what it really means, rush into religious controversy, for personal or party purposes, or even for no further purpose than the excitement of its hue and cry. We cannot reason with such opinion, for it rests on no rational conviction, and there is nothing in it to which reason can appeal. But for this very cause it has no solidity, and cannot therefore carry weight. It may fan the popular passions into fiery outburst for a moment, but flames that owe more to wind than they do to fuel soon die down; however much they may scorch and blacken, they have nor time nor power to consume. Such is public opinion—*popularis aura*—in the bad sense of the term. But there is another and a nobler kind of public opinion—the opinion of those who are in serious earnest with their religion: they may differ widely in the degree of their own spiritual attainment, as well as on many details, both of practice and belief, but they agree in believing their religion and its paramount importance; they judge religious questions from a religious point of view; and they respect the religion of others, however diverse from their own, wherever they perceive that it is real. This class, though unobtrusive, is large, and, in the long run, influential, and constitutes the backbone of our national Church. And every influence which increases the mutual charity of its members, and assists its component sections to understand one another, will further the progress and intensify the power of religion. It is to this class, therefore—the religious public in the best sense of the term—that our foregoing considerations may be of use; for they tend to show that the different parties, as they are called, in the English Church have not only co-existed, as a fact of history, for the last three

centuries, but represent a distinction which is far older than Christianity itself, and must reappear, by a psychological necessity, wherever Christianity exists. And this throws light upon the true significance of that comprehensive or compromising tone, as it is often called, which is characteristic of our national Church. Our English love of compromise, our genius for compromise, is confessedly one of the causes of our social stability and political success. But this would not be the case if compromise were merely a negative thing, an inability to draw logical conclusions, a half-hearted hesitation between opposite alternatives, an unwillingness to commit ourselves, a lack of the courage of our convictions: it is nothing of the kind. Compromise, of the sort which is a power in the world, is only another name for comprehension. It is the popular, instinctive, unselfconscious recognition of the fact which the philosopher sees explicitly—that concrete truth, or reality, is a harmony of opposites; or, in other words, includes more attributes than any partial mode of expression can convey, and, to be grasped as a whole, therefore, must be regarded, like a stereoscopic picture, from diverse, independent points of view.

And this feature of our national character is inevitably reflected in our Church. There were two broadly distinct parties throughout the English Reformation, and the Church of England endeavoured to comprehend them both, not as a mere piece of political opportunism, but because both possessed elements of truth, which the national instinct recognised to an extent of which its temporary leaders, whether ecclesiastical or civil, were often themselves unaware. For there is a subconscious action of national genius, as well as of individual brains. Now one and now the other of these parties has been dominant; but both have alike persisted, and by their coexistence and interaction broadened and deepened the whole tone of our

Church. Each in its turn has been opposed, and has survived the opposition, and the exclusion of either would be detrimental to the fulness of truth.

But at the present moment the attack is not upon the mystical and personal aspect of religion, but upon its outward manifestation, its sacramental side. Lawlessness in this direction, and disloyalty to the deliberate teaching of the English Church, wherever they occur, we are all agreed must be suppressed. But the outcry of the moment goes far beyond this, and attacks all sacramental religion. It is opportune, therefore, to remember that sacramental religion is no mere legacy of mediævalism, but is older than the Christian, older than the Jewish, Church,—as old as the earliest records of our race, and that it is so because it arises from a natural tendency of the human mind—a tendency whose power and permanence we have only lately been enabled, by our comparative study of religions, to appreciate. That tendency, moreover, is profoundly philosophical, for it rests on a sense of the intimate connection between matter and spirit, the action of matter through body and brain upon the spiritual life, and the need of spirit to find its utterance through material things—truths with which science and art are alike familiar. Nor does the fact that religion has become more spiritual with the progress of the ages imply that it has outgrown the need of sacramental expression. The music of Handel and Beethoven is more spiritual than that of barbarous races, but it is none the less dependent for its manifestation upon the medium of sound. And so with religion : as long as we think with brains and act with hands, and are tempted by the senses, and inspired by melody and art,—as long, in a word, as our body is an integral part of our personality, there will be those whose faith, however pure and undefiled will need to find expression in material form.

Moreover, there is a peculiar appositeness in sacramental

religion at the present time. For materialism, that ancient enemy of spiritual life, was never perhaps more rampant than to-day. It is true that as an intellectual system we believe it to be discredited,—more so than was the case perhaps some thirty years ago. But it is otherwise with moral materialism in its various forms. Luxury or the desire of luxury meets us on every side. Gold and jewels, dress and amusement, costliness in meat and drink, are now as eagerly pursued as ever in the bygone ages of the world; while their pursuit is even less tempered by idealism than it has sometimes been. The rich enjoy these things, and the poor envy their enjoyment, and both are alike materialized. Much, again, of our current literature makes in the same direction, by interpreting thought and emotion in physiological terms. The psychology, for instance, which is now so widely taught, may not be materialistic in a technical sense; but of the materialistic bias which it cannot fail to impart to half-educated minds there cannot be the shadow of a doubt; while many of our popular novels, whose ethical influence, though indirect, is at present immense, insinuate similar teaching in their every page. And in a sense all this is inevitable, since it is among the natural results of the commercial and scientific progress amidst which we live. For human nature being what it is, the development of commerce and physical science, noble as they are in themselves, must often lead to an ignoble estimate of the relative importance of material things.

But precisely because our modern materialism is founded upon this basis, because it arises from the perversion of things which are in themselves valuable and true, it can only be counteracted by restoring these things to their proper use. We, with the results of our commerce and our science all around us, can never regard the material world as an illusion, or as a thing to be ignored. And, if we

would correct the foul abuse of it, we must do so by exhibiting its nobler use—the power of beauty, and art, and wealth, and scientific invention, and political success, to alleviate sin and sorrow and further the spiritual progress of man. And one of the means by which such teaching has been conveyed in the past is, beyond question, the sacramental system of the Church, with all those external adjuncts which that system has gathered round it, pointing, like a great cathedral, through material to spiritual things. That system may at times, and in places, itself have sunk into materialism, but "*abusus non tollit usum.*" We do not condemn a thing that is useful for its possible misuse. Sacramentalism exhibits vividly and openly *coram populo* the fact that spirit is the final cause of matter, the end in which matter finds its meaning and truth. It is therefore in its essence a standing protest against materialism; and as such is as needful as ever in the world to-day.

J. R. ILLINGWORTH.

*THE WORD "ATONE" IN EXTRA-RITUAL
LITERATURE.*

Two conceptions or modes of thinking of God run through the Old Testament. According to the one Jehovah is a righteous Ruler, a Judge and moral Governor of men and the world. Only moral offences are considered sin. These Jehovah punishes as a righteous Judge, or He forgives them of His mercy and goodness. In this aspect what characterizes Jehovah is righteousness. This conception prevails in all the extra-ritual literature.

In another aspect Jehovah is a person dwelling in a house, whom men approach in worship, a sensitive Being or Nature which sin disturbs. In this aspect what characterizes Jehovah is holiness, and all sin is regarded as uncleanness. But sin now embraces much more than moral offences: to touch a dead body is a sin, and that not because it is disobedience to a command forbidding contact with the dead, but because it is an act incurring uncleanness, which creates a disability in the worshipper on account of the reaction against it of the nature of the Being worshipped. These ceremonial observances, as they are called, are many of them very ancient, and they are of very various origins. Many of them, however, are religious in their origin, the acts that cause defilement having been acts done in rites rendered to other deities than Jehovah. It is altogether a misapprehension to suppose these so-called ceremonial defilements a mere manufactured and factitious symbolism, designed to suggest moral ideas. When their origin was forgotten, and men were far removed from the soil and conditions of thought out of which they arose, they may have served this use; but originally the uncleannesses were considered real, and the lustrations and sacrifices which purified them were equally real. As it was in con-

nection with the worship of God that the idea of His holiness was suggested, it was naturally in priestly circles that the idea was developed. This fact of itself makes it probable that the conception of God's holiness is not less ancient than that of His righteousness. And one may even go further and surmise that some of the laws in which the conception of holiness is expressed, such as Leviticus xvii. ff., may in point of antiquity not stand far below the earliest portions of the Old Testament, though, as we now possess them, they may be mixed with newer elements and overgrown with later developments. These two ways of regarding God—as righteous and as holy—are further interesting because they extend into the New Testament, the former appearing in St. Paul's writings, and the latter in the Epistle to the Hebrews. St. Paul is, in the main, the successor of the prophets, the writer to the Hebrews of the priestly legislators.

The word *atone* (כִּפֶּה) is employed both in the ritual and extra-ritual literature, though with considerable differences of usage.¹ The original physical sense of the word may be somewhat uncertain, as it is used in parallelism sometimes with words that signify *to cover*, and sometimes with words signifying *to blot out* or obliterate. For example, Jeremiah xviii. 23, "*Atone not Thou their guilt, and blot not out their sin from before Thee,*" becomes in Nehemiah iii. 37 (E.V. iv. 5), "*Cover not Thou their guilt, and let not their sin be blotted out from before Thee.*" It is probable, however, that the original sense of the term was *to cover*, as the common verb "to cover" (*kissah*) is so often used in the same way, as Psalm xxxii. 1, "Blessed is the man whose sin is covered" (*kesui*); Psalm lxxxv. 2, "Thou hast taken away the guilt of Thy people, Thou hast covered (*kissitha*) all their sin." It has been supposed by some that the verb

¹ In his little work, *Der Begriff der Sühne im Alten Testament*, Riehm made a full collection of the materials, and rightly estimated them.

atone is a denominative from the word *kopher*, "ransom for life" (cf. Job xxxiii. 24), but the idea lying under *kopher* was most likely that of a covering, and the suggested derivation adds nothing to our knowledge. The word *atone* or *cover*, however, is no more used in a literal sense, but always figuratively; it expresses an idea, a moral, not a physical, act. Even when blood atones or covers the uncleanness of a person or thing, or the unclean thing or person, the uncleanness or person is not physically covered by the blood laid on them, because the blood of atonement was chiefly applied to the altar and very rarely sprinkled upon a person or thing.

To atone was to cover, but the covering was not literal but figurative and ideal. Hence a more curious question arises: What was it that was supposed to be covered? Was it the offence, so that it was no more visible to the injured party, or, as the case might be, to the judge who had to take notice of it; or was it the face or eyes of the injured person or judge that were covered, so that he no more could see the offence? The usage seems to be various. When the question of wrong was one between men and men, the atonement or covering was usually a gift, and in this case it appears to be the eyes of the injured person or judge that are covered so that he does not see. Thus in Genesis xx. 16, Abimelech makes reparation to Sarah, saying, "Behold, I have given thy brother a thousand pieces of silver; behold, it is for thee a covering (*kesûth*) of the eyes." And in Genesis xxxii. 20, Jacob says, in regard to Esau, "I will atone (cover, *akapperah*) his face (R.V., appease him) with the present that goeth before me."¹ So in 1 Samuel xii. 3, Samuel asks, in regard to his conduct as judge, "Of whose hand have I taken a ransom (*kopher*), to blind mine eyes therewith?" as it is said in Exodus xxiii.

¹ Some would read "his anger" for "his face," cf. Proverbs xvi. 14. The change seems unnecessary.

8, "A gift blindeth them that have sight" (Deut xvi. 19). Possibly the rather obscure passage Job ix. 24 may express a similar idea, where, speaking of the wrongs done by men on each other, Job says, "The earth is given into the hands of the wicked; He covereth the faces of the judges thereof; if it be not He, who then is it?"

When men were injured, or when they had to judge a cause, their eyes might be covered by a gift, blinding them to the wrong, but reverence forbade such a mode of thought in regard to God: "The Lord your God, He is God of gods and Lord of lords, which regardeth not persons nor taketh a bribe" (Deut. x. 17). It may indeed be made a question what the primary idea of sacrifice was; if it was a gift to God, it might have been supposed to cover His eyes. Care, at any rate, was taken to obviate false ideas connected with it; for God is represented as saying, even in regard to the atoning blood, "I have given it to you upon the altar, to make atonement (*lekapper*) for your souls" (Lev. xvii. 11).

In the religious use of the word *kipper* in the extra-ritual literature, the subject who atones or covers is God Himself, and the object covered is the sin or offence. In this use the piel *kipper* must mean either "to declare covered" or "to hold covered." In many cases the figure of covering was no more present to the mind, and *kipper* was equivalent to *forgive*, e.g., Psalm lxxv. 3, "Iniquities prevail against us, as for our transgressions Thou wilt forgive them"; Psalm lxxviii. 38, "But He being full of compassion forgave their iniquity" (Ps. lxxix. 9; Ezek. xvi. 63). The idea, however, of covering the sin, so that it was no more visible, was very apt to recur and appear in the parallelism; hence such figures as "blot out from Thy sight" (Jer. xviii. 23), cast the sin behind the back (Isa. xxxviii. 17), cast it into the depths of the sea (Mic. vii. 19), and frequently "cover" it; as, on the other hand, the Psalmist complains, "Thou hast set our iniquities before Thee,

our secret sins in the light of Thy countenance" (Ps. xc. 8). It is always the sin or offence that is the object of *kipper*, not the offending persons; if the persons be alluded to, the act is done *for* or *in behalf* of them (Deut. xxi. 8; Ezek. xvi. 63; 2 Chron. xxx. 18; in the last passage the division of verses is quite wrong).

As it is God Himself who performs the act expressed by *kipper*, no question of *means* can arise. In the extra-ritual literature sacrifice is never the means. In none of the prophets, not even Ezekiel, is the sin of the people forgiven through sacrifice. In Isaiah liii. perhaps the sacrificial idea appears, though it is lifted up into the region of human life. In one passage, 1 Samuel iii. 14, an allusion is made to sacrifice which appears strange: "I have sworn that the iniquity of Eli's house shall not be atoned with sacrifice nor offering for ever." Might it not be permissible to render, "that the iniquity of Eli's house in (regard to) sacrifice and offering shall not be atoned for ever"? (cf. chap. ii. 11-17, etc.; Isaiah xxii. 14). There is another passage also of interest, 1 Samuel xxvi. 19, where David says to Saul, when remonstrating with him for his persecution of him, "If it be the Lord that hath stirred thee up against me, let Him smell an offering." David regards Saul's persecution of him as due to some aberration or frenzy of mind. It is possible that it is the Lord who has struck him with this aberration. If so, it is in chastisement of some inadvertent or unremembered sin of which he has been guilty. Therefore for this let him offer a sacrifice that the Lord may remove the stroke from him. This is, however, just the proper use of sacrifice, viz., for sins of inadvertency.

In several passages the idea of sacrifice has been found where it is really not present. One instance is Deuteronomy xxi. 8. This was the case where the body of a murdered person was discovered, without its being possible to trace the murderer. The elders of the city nearest to which

the body was found were to take an unblemished heifer, never subjected to the yoke, bring her to a valley with running water, and there slay her by breaking her neck. The elders were then to wash their hands over the heifer and protest their innocence: "Our hands have not shed this blood! And they were to pray, "Atone, O Lord, for Thy people Israel; suffer not innocent blood to remain in the midst of Thy people. And the blood shall be atoned or covered to them." This was no sacrifice, but a symbolical judicial action. That the animal was not a sacrifice is certain from the fact that her neck was broken. By the murder guilt of blood was brought on the land, which of right could be removed only by the death of the murderer (Num. xxxv. 30). In this case he could not be found, and a symbolical execution was performed, which, illustrating the principles of the law, was held sufficient. A similar, though more painful and tragic, instance occurs in 2 Samuel xxi. A famine of three years afflicted the land in David's days, and on inquiring the cause at the oracle he was answered, "There is blood upon Saul and on his house, because he put to death the Gibeonites." [The narrative then explains that the Gibeonites were not Israelites, but of the remnant of the Amorites; but the children of Israel had sworn to them to spare them (Josh. ix.), and Saul sought to slay them in his zeal for Israel.] Receiving this answer, David turned to the Gibeonites, asking, "By what means shall I make atonement (akapperah), that ye may bless the heritage of the Lord?" The Gibeonites refuse to accept a blood-wit of money. They intimate also that they have no quarrel with the people of Israel, only with Saul and his house: "The man who consumed us, and who thought to destroy us, that we should not remain in all the border of Israel, let seven men of his sons be given us, and we will hang them up unto Jehovah." Their request was granted. To some minds the whole transaction will seem

a dreadful instance of sanguinary superstition. However it be looked at, it is evident that David acted with perfect integrity, deferring, as he always did, to the religious authorities. And perhaps something might be said even on the question of superstition, which, if it existed, would lie in connecting the famine with Saul's breach of the oath and covenant with the Gibeonites. The point, however, is that the slaughter of Saul's sons was not a sacrifice, but an execution. It may be doubtful whether the phrase "before Jehovah" (v. 9) should be taken locally, meaning, in the vicinity of the sanctuary, or, ideally, unto Jehovah, in recognition of His law (cf. v. 6). Saul's offence was not merely that of the common manslayer, it was breach of the covenant and oath to the Gibeonites lying on Israel, and the story illustrates the inviolable sanctity of the oath in early times (comp. the story of Jonathan, 1 Sam. xiv. 24 ff.). At all events, bloodguiltiness lay on the land because of Saul's deed, and as the guilty person was no more amenable himself he was made amenable in his descendants.

As in the extra-ritual literature it is God Himself who "atones" sin, while there is no question of means, there may be a question of motive. Naturally the motives will usually be found within Himself, in His own nature and attributes, or in His consideration of His operations in redemption already wrought. The effect of sin upon the mind of Jehovah, whatever the sin was, whether idolatry, injustice, or disobedience, was to arouse His anger. The Divine anger is not an attribute like righteousness. Anger in God is what it is in men, an affection, and is transient. The Divine nature is capable of wrath, though God is slow to anger. Then the natural result of anger is punishment of the wrongdoer. But as anger is but an affection and not the fundamental character of the Divine mind, which rather is longsuffering and compassion, this prevailing disposition may restrain the anger so that no punishment follows, but

forgiveness. Thus in Psalm lxxviii. 38 it is said : " They (the people) were not faithful in His covenant ; but He being full of compassion forgave their iniquity and destroyed them not ; yea, many a time turned He His anger away and stirred not up all His wrath, for He remembered that they were flesh." Very often God is represented as restraining His anger " for His name's sake." The phrase is a late one, and epitomizes past redemptive history. It refers to Jehovah's revelation of Himself within Israel, to His great deeds done as God of Israel on the stage of history, deeds done in the eyes of the nations, and a beginning at least of His revelation of Himself to them. Consideration of this redemptive work already begun, with the purpose that through Israel it should reach all the nations, restrains His anger against Israel. In the poem, Deuteronomy xxxii. 26, it is said : " I would make the remembrance of them (Israel) cease from among men were it not that I feared the provocation of the enemy ; lest their adversaries should misdeem, lest they should say, Our hand is exalted." In Ezekiel xx. the whole course of Israel's history is explained on this principle. That which has prolonged the existence of Israel and given it a history is Jehovah's regard for His own name. And when the prophets of the exile, who had hoped that Israel's trials would turn their hearts to God, see themselves disappointed, they fall back on this idea : " For Mine own sake do I defer Mine anger, that I cut thee not off. I have refined thee, but not as silver. For Mine own sake do I do it ; for how should My name be profaned ? " (Isa. xlviii. 9 ff.). The redemptive purpose and historical progress made already towards fulfilling it may contain many details, such as the fact that Israel is His people, whom He has redeemed, His love to their forefathers, the care that the knowledge of Him which has begun to flow upon the nations should not suffer a recession or backset, and other things. Thus in Deuteronomy ix.

26 Moses prays : " O Lord God, destroy not Thy people and Thine inheritance which Thou hast redeemed. Remember Thy servants Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Let not Egypt say, Because the Lord was not able to, bring them into the land which He promised them, therefore He slew them in the wilderness. Yet they are Thy people and Thine inheritance." A similar circle of ideas appears in Exodus xxxii. 10 and Numbers xiv. 11 : " And now let the power of the Lord be great, according as Thou hast spoken : the Lord is slow to anger and plenteous in mercy. Pardon, I pray Thee, the iniquity of this people according to Thy mercy. And the Lord said, I pardon according to thy word."

Another point is this, illustrated in the history of the people in the wilderness, and in all the prophets. In the period of the Exodus the anger of the Lord expressed itself in plagues, and in the prophetic age in the people's subjugation by the nations and exile from their own land. Yet a full end was not made of the people : " The eyes of the Lord are upon the sinful kingdom to destroy it, saving that I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob " (Am. ix. 8). The point here is that the righteous anger of Jehovah displayed and illustrated itself. It received so far a certain satisfaction. He did not stir up all His wrath nor make a full end of the nation, which might have been the natural issue of their disobedience, but His righteousness was shown and His rule vindicated. In His returning mercy He might even feel that His chastisements had been too heavy : " Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her that she has received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins " (Isa. xl. 2).

Though the motives to Jehovah's " atoning " or forgiving sin be chiefly found in Himself or in the respect which He has to His redemptive purpose with mankind and the beginnings of it already made, a few cases occur where human intercession is had respect to by Him. The in-

stance of Abraham's entreaties for Sodom is the most remarkable in early history. Lower down Amos (ch. vii.) represents himself as interceding for the people. Preparations for destroying Israel were shown him, and he prayed: "O Lord, forgive I beseech Thee; how shall Jacob stand? for he is small. And the Lord said, It shall not be." Jeremiah frequently intercedes for the people, though both to Him and to Ezekiel the intimation is given that the time for intercession is past: "Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, my mind could not be toward this people; cast them out of my sight" (Jer. xv. 1). In the wilderness, when the people made the golden calf, Moses interceded with effect, though the Lord had said: "This is a stiff-necked people. Now therefore let Me alone that My anger may wax hot against them and that I may consume them; and I will make of thee a great nation" (Exodus xxxii.); and also on other occasions when the people murmured (Num. xiv. 14). On these occasions Moses identifies himself with the people, devotedly refusing life to himself if they are to perish. He also profoundly feels and acknowledges the people's sin, and his acknowledgment, from the relation which he assumes to them, may be considered their confession. His confession and intercession prevail with God, and it is in reference to them, no doubt, that Moses says beforehand to the people, "Peradventure I may 'atone' (akapperah) for your sin" (Exod. xxxii. 30).

There is an interesting passage in Numbers xxv. The case is that of the sin of Israel with the Midianitish women. Phinehas seeing an Israelite prince bring in a Midianitish woman for purposes of fornication, thrust them both through with a dart. And the Lord said: "Phinehas hath turned My wrath away from the children of Israel, in that he was jealous with My jealousy among them, so that I consumed them not in My jealousy. Therefore I give unto him My covenant of peace because he was jealous for his God and

'atoned' (wayekapper) for the children of Israel." Here it is the zeal of Phinehas that atones, his zeal expressing itself in the act of vengeance upon the sinners. It does so because it is the zeal of Jehovah. Phinehas enters into Jehovah's mind, acts in His mind, and thereby magnifies and sanctifies Him. This atones.

The comparison of these passages in the extra-ritual literature speaking of atonement and forgiveness may not seem to yield much result. There may be other passages which would suggest additional thoughts. In those cited the chief points are these :

God alone forgives sin and covers it. To cover or "atone" sin, when said of God, is a mere figure for "forgive." Frequently the figure is no more present to the mind, though it is very liable to recur and be introduced in the context.

Though sin provokes the anger of God, anger is with Him but a passing emotion ; as the Psalmist says, His anger is but for a moment (Ps. xxx. 5). The prevailing attribute of His nature is mercy, and on penitence and confession He is ready to forgive : " I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord, and Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin " (Ps. xxxii. 5).

Motives to forgiveness which God finds in Himself are many : His compassion, His memory of His former servants the fathers—" for my servant David's sake," respect to His covenant, and for His own name's sake, the last motive embracing many particulars and considerations of the widest kind.

The wrath called forth by the sin of individuals or His people often expresses itself in plagues and, in the prophetic age, in the humiliation of the people under the nations and in exile. Thus His righteous anger receives a certain satisfaction ; it is displayed, as is said in Isaiah v. 16, " He is magnified in judgment, and sanctified in righteousness."

His nature is revealed. His righteousness is declared or shown (Rom. iii. 25).

In another way satisfaction is rendered to Him (if the phrase may be used), and His anger is appeased, viz., when men enter into His just resentment, and feeling it act in His mind; as when the Levites intervened to chastise the people for their idolatry in worshipping the calf, or when Phinehas was jealous with the jealousy of the Lord and executed judgment.

God's anger is also turned away and sin covered or "atoned" by the intercession of His nearest servants. There is a solidarity between these men and the people. Their confession of the people's sin is the people's confession, and their mind the people's mind. And yet they are different, innocent of the people's guilt. They are near to God. He has respect to them. Their intercession usually sets before God the motives in Himself from which He acts, His compassion, and all the great considerations expressed in the phrase "His name's sake," His gracious purpose of making Himself, who is God alone, known to all mankind, and the historical acts to that end already done.

Finally, the question may be suggested, What approach is made in these points, or in some of them, towards the New Testament doctrine?

A. B. DAVIDSON.

HISTORICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

XLVII. FREEDOM.

VERSE 13 resumes the subject of verse 1.¹ "Now, as I was saying, *you* have been called to be free, but do not misunderstand the word! Do not misuse the freedom as an opening for sensual enjoyment! Rather serve one another through love. You desire to be slaves of the Law. Let this service to others be your slavery, and remember that for you the Law is completely fulfilled in the observance of the one principle, *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself*. Whereas, if you show malignity in word or deed to your neighbour, the issue will be mutual destruction."

Very characteristic here is the recurrence to the word Freedom; the most remarkable feature in the whole Epistle is the prominence given to the idea of Freedom. An arithmetical statement will make this plain. The words *ἐλεύθερος*, *ἐλευθερία*, *ἐλευθερώω*, occur in this Epistle eleven times; but in *Romans* they occur only seven times, in the two *Corinthians* eight times, and in all the rest of Paul's Epistles twice.

It is not a sufficient explanation to say that the idea was forced into prominence by the subject on which Paul has to write. The same subject is treated at far greater length in *Romans*, and the words occur much less frequently. The idea of freedom is not the only form under which the struggle against Judaism can be expressed; one might also look at it from other points of view. The prominence of the idea is something special to this Epistle.

¹ The particle *γάρ*, in 13, is not to be treated as giving a reason for something said in the last verse. It indicates that the proper subject is taken up again after a digression.

It may be said that Paul here appeals to a specially strong feeling in the minds of his readers: that it is because they were free in heart and in aspiration that he tries to rouse this strong characteristic of theirs against the Judaistic propaganda.

That argument does injustice to Paul. From that point of view one will always misjudge him. If he simply desired to win a victory over Judaism, he might appeal to them in that way; but he had a far wider view and aim. He does not simply select such arguments as will weigh most at the moment with his Galatian readers. He is content with no victory that does not strengthen the whole mind and character of the Galatians. As has been already pointed out, his purpose in the Epistle is not to frame an argument against Judaism: he tries to elevate and ennoble the minds of the Galatians, so that they may look at the question from a higher and truer point of view.

Therefore he does not seize on the more powerful emotions and passions of his readers, and try to harness these against Judaism. He tries to strengthen their weakness, and to make their minds harmonious and well-balanced, so that they may judge truly and wisely. If Paul calls the Galatians to freedom, and repeats the call, and presses home the idea to them, it is not because they were already specially free in mind and thought. It is because they were a people that needed to be roused to freedom—a people in whom the aspiration after freedom was dormant, and must be carefully fostered and fanned into flame.

It is obvious how appropriate and necessary this topic was in addressing a people like the Phrygians and Lycaonians of the South-Galatian Province, "just beginning to rise from the torpor of Oriental peasant life, and to appreciate the beauty of Greek thought and the splendour

of Roman power.”¹ Lack of the sense of individuality and freedom characterizes the Oriental mind as distinguished from the Western. That sense was peculiarly lacking in the Phrygians, who were reckoned by the ancients as pre-eminently the nation born and intended for slaves; but what is called the Phrygian character by the ancients was really the character of the Anatolian plateau as a whole (apart from the mountaineers of the coastward rim), simple, easy-minded, contented, good-humoured, submissive, yet capable of being roused to extreme religious enthusiasm; a people possessing many of the fundamental virtues, but needing intermixture with a more sprightly people in order to develop into a really strong and good race. Mixture and intercourse and education had planted the seeds of higher individual development among them, but the young growth needed careful tending. All that is said in chapter vi. of *St. Paul the Traveller* on the situation in Antioch, Iconium, Derbe, and Lystra at the time of Paul’s first visit, and on the spirit of his work there, bears on this subject. The Epistle is a continuation of the work of the first journey.

So he leads them up towards freedom. But there is a danger. Freedom may easily be misconstrued and abused, and he points out the safeguard. It lies in Love; and he quotes the Saviour’s epitome of the whole law of human conduct.

A single enunciation of this so important warning, about the danger and the safeguard, was not enough. Therefore a special paragraph repeats and enlarges it.

XLVIII. THE SPIRITUAL LIFE, v. 16-26.

“What I mean is this: if you make the Spirit your guide, you will not live the sensual life. For, in the Divine

¹ *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 149.

plan, the spirit and the flesh are ever in opposition within your minds; and in so far as you walk by the Spirit you are freed from Law. You can see for yourselves what are the results of the two opposing principles. Around you in the Galatian cities you see¹ the vices that are the works of the flesh; and they who are guilty of those vices shall never be the heirs of God. I warned you against those evils, when I was last among you,² and I warn you now again.

“The life of the Spirit matures in love and the kindred virtues: where they rule, Law ceases. If you are of Jesus Christ, you have nailed on the cross the flesh with its passions and lust, and died to the life of sensuality. Therefore, if you make the Spirit your guide, this must be seen in your daily life. To take a special example of the general rule, if you are jealous and censorious of your neighbours, you are not living the spiritual life.”

The prominent faults of South-Galatian society are set before the readers in *vv.* 19–21. These are the faults that they saw everywhere round them, and these are the faults to which they were themselves liable. Paul had seen this on his second journey, and had already cautioned them. His first journey was the period of conversion, followed by organization: on his second journey the dangers that beset the young Churches were brought painfully home to him, and he warned them against reproducing under a disguise of Christianity the faults of their age and surroundings. Now once more he strives against them. He must strengthen their whole nature and character, and then the Judaistic evil will be corrected with their growing strength.

¹ *Φανερά* is in an emphatic position as first word of the sentence, and must be pressed in translation.

² See the last paragraph of this section.

XLIX. THE FAULTS OF THE SOUTH-GALATIC CITIES.

In the list of fifteen faults, there are three groups, corresponding to three different kinds of influence that were likely to affect strongly recent converts from paganism. Such converts were liable to be led astray by habits and ways of thought to which they had been brought up, owing to (1) the national religion, (2) their position in a municipality, (3) the customs of society in Hellenistic cities.¹ We take each group separately.

1. Faults fostered by the old Anatolian religion. These are five: fornication, impurity, wantonness, idolatry, sorcery or magic. The first three are usually regarded by commentators as springing from the character of the individuals addressed, in whom sensual passion is assumed to have been peculiarly strong. But more probably and more naturally, Paul thinks here of the influence exerted by their old religion in patronizing vice, and treating it as part of the Divine life.² The subject is too unpleasant to enter on. Yet to understand properly the position of the new religion in Asia Minor, one must take into consideration that the old religion had remained as a relic of a very primitive state of society; that it consecrated as the Divine life the freedom of the beasts of the field; that it exhibited to the celebrants in the holiest Mysteries the relations of the Divine personages, who are the emblems and representatives and guarantees of that primitive social system amid which the religion had taken form; and that it regarded all moral restraint and rules as interference

¹ The list 1 *Corinthians* vi. 9 ff. is not exactly parallel, but near enough to be called by Steck the model after which this whole list of fifteen faults in *Galatians* has been forged. The contrast between them is remarkable. The Galatian list is narrowly defined: the Corinthian list ranges over the various crimes of human nature.

Not so in *Col.* iii. 5 ff., where he is expressly speaking of the evil tendencies that lie in human nature and character.

with the Divine freedom. The religion of the country was actually on a lower level than the tone of ordinary pagan society. Vice was not regarded as wrong in pagan society : it was regarded as necessary—the only evil lying in excess. But in the old religion it was inculcated as a duty ; and service at the temple for a period in the practice of vice had once, apparently, been universally required, and was still imposed as a duty on individuals through special revelation of the Divine will. This extreme was looked down upon with contempt, but without serious moral condemnation, as mere superstition by the more educated society of the cities. Yet even in the cities it certainly was far from having lost its hold ; and to obey the Divine command and live the Divine life at the temple for a period caused no stigma on the individual, and was actually recorded publicly in votive offerings with inscriptions.

From this point of view the third fault—*ἀσέλγεια*—is illustrated. Lightfoot explains that it implies something openly insolent, shocking public decency. The act which was most characteristic of Phrygian religion in the eyes of the world was the public self-mutilation practised sometimes by its votaries in religious frenzy. The word *ἀσέλγεια* is the strongest term of its kind in Pauline usage ; and acts like that public mutilation, or those alluded to in the last words of the preceding paragraph, merit it.

It is unnecessary to say a word about the faults of idolatry and magic. The latter stood in close relation to the native religion ; and it is difficult to draw the line between religion and magic in the numerous class of inscriptions in which curses and imprecations of evil or death are invoked on personal foes and on wrongdoers.

We shall not rightly conceive the Asia Minor character, unless we remember that the excesses of which it is capable

spring from religious enthusiasm. It is peculiarly subject to religious excitement. A passage of Socrates, that careful and unprejudiced historian, is valuable here, as illustrating both the Anatolian character and the influence exerted on it by Christianity. He says, iv. 28, that Phrygians exercise stronger self-restraint than other races, being less prone to anger than Scythians and Thracians,¹ and less given to pleasure than the eastern peoples (not fond of circus and theatre, and hating fornication as a monstrous crime). Along with the Phrygians he includes the Paphlagonians, so that it is the typical Anatolian races that he describes.

These were the nations that eagerly followed Novatian in refusing the sacraments to those who had after baptism been guilty of serious sin. Like Paul's Galatians, the Phrygian Novatians were eager to go to the extreme in religious matters; and, like them, they tended towards Judaism,² and made Easter agree with the Passover. It is precisely the same tendency of mind that caused both movements: not fickleness and changeableness, but enthusiasm, intense religious feeling, the tendency to extreme severity, and the leaning towards the Oriental and the Jewish forms.³

2. Faults connected with the municipal life in the cities of Asia Minor. Every one who reads this enumeration—enmities, strife, rivalry (so Lightfoot), outbursts of wrath, caballings, factions, parties, jealousies—eight out of

¹ He evidently takes them as representatives of the northern barbarians, and would certainly have summed up the Gauls along with them.

² Novatian himself showed no tendency to Judaism.

³ One might trace the tendency of the Phrygians towards Judaistic practices through the intermediate period, and in other parts of Phrygia. At Colossæ Paul had to correct the inclination to "a feast-day, or a new moon or a sabbath day" (*Col.* ii. 16), and to point out wherein lay the true circumcision (*Col.* ii. 11). In an inscription of about A.D. 200, which is probably Jewish-Christian, the name *Azuma* is used to indicate Easter (see *Cities and Bish. of Phr.*, pt. ii., p. 545 ff.; and there is now more to say about this inscription from recent discovery). On the Judaic-Christian inscriptions of Phrygia, see *Cities and Bish. of Phr.*, pt. ii., pp. 566, 652 f., 674 f., 700.

fifteen—must be struck with the importance attached by Paul to one special tendency to error among the Galatians.

Partly, no doubt, the Judaizing tendency would lead to division and strife, for we can well imagine that it was not universal, and that there was at least a minority that continued faithful to Paul in the Galatian Churches. But it would be a mistake to suppose that Paul was thinking of that one fact only: that would not explain the striking prominence of the idea. He is here viewing their life as a whole, and is not thinking only of the Judaistic question.

Firstly, the rivalry of city against city was one of the most marked features of municipal life in Asia Minor. The great cities of a province wrangled for precedence, until even the Emperor had to be invoked to decide between their rival claims for the first place. They invented titles of honour for themselves so as to outshine their rivals, and appropriated the titles that their rivals had invented. So in the Province Asia, Smyrna and Pergamos vied with Ephesus; in Bithynia Nikomedia vied with Nicæa; in Cilicia Anazarbos vied with Tarsos; and in Galatia we may be sure that Iconium vied with Antioch.¹

As Mommsen says, "the spirit of faction here at once takes possession of every association"; and again, "the urban rivalries belong to the general character of Hellenic politics, but especially of the politics in Asia Minor."²

But, if that was true of the unregenerate citizens, had the converts changed their nature? Surely not! The same characteristics existed in them as before. They were still citizens of Antioch or of Iconium. Throughout Paul's Epistles we see that his converts had not changed their nature, but were still liable to fall into the errors of their

¹ In Macedonia Philippi vied in the same way with Amphipolis, of which a trace is perceivable in *Acts* xvi. 12: see *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 206.

² *Provinces of the Roman Empire*, ch. viii., vol. i., pp. 357, 329.

pre-Christian life. We may feel very certain that there were strife and wrangling and jealousy between the Antiochian Church and the Iconian Church about precedence and comparative dignity.

Second, even within the cities there was room for jealousy and strife. There was in Antioch and Lystra the great division between Roman or Latin citizens of the *Colonia* and the *incolæ* or native dwellers: the burning subject of inequality of rights was always close at hand. We may be sure that there were both Roman and non-Roman members of the Church. No list of Galatian Christians has come down to us; but the Colony Corinth, where Latin names form so considerable a proportion¹ of the known Christians, furnishes a pertinent illustration. In Iconium and Derbe, where no Roman element of any consequence existed, there was the other cause (not absent in the *Coloniæ*) of difference in race—the native element, the Greek element, the Jewish element. Of these the native element was probably the weaker in the Churches, because the natives who were familiar with the Greek language usually reckoned themselves Greek: in fact the Greek element consisted mainly not of settlers from Greece, but of those Phrygian and Lycaonian families that had adopted Greek manners and education and dress.²

It is noteworthy that at Lystra those who are said to have spoken in the Lycaonian tongue were not Christians, but pagans (*Acts* xiv.). It was among the more educated classes that Christianity spread most rapidly (*St. Paul the Trav.*, p. 133 f.).

With these causes at work, it is easily seen how caballing

¹ Achaicus, Crispus, Fortunatus, Gaius, Lucius, Quartus, Tertius, Titius Justus. See art. "Corinth" in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, i. p. 480.

² That is the regular sense of "Ἕλληνες in the imperial inscriptions of Asia Minor; e.g., in such Provincial Associations as the Hellenes in (the Province) Asia (οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἕλληνες), or the Society of Hellenes in Galatia, the Hellenized natives of the Province are meant.

and jealousy should be a serious danger in the young Churches.

As Mommsen says again of Asia Minor: "Rivalries exist, as between town and town, so in every town between the several circles and the several houses." There were no great political or patriotic interests to absorb the passions and powers of man, and so they frittered away their energies in petty jealousies and rivalries and factions.

Paul's words seem, beyond any question, written with an eye to the ordinary Græco-Asiatic city: "Let us not be vainglorious, challenging one another, envying one another, v. 26." Vainglory and pride in petty distinctions was the leading motive in municipal life; the challenging of one another to competition in this foolish strife was almost the largest part of their history amid the peace and prosperity of the Roman rule.

But that is not the type of the North-Galatian tribes; the Gaulish element was an aristocratic one, and such are not the faults of an aristocracy.

If the Churches were thus liable to import the old urban rivalries into their mutual relations, what was Paul's part likely to be? Would he not impress on them the excellence of unity, the criminality of faction and jealousy? Would he not, even in small things, avoid anything and any word likely to rouse their mutual rivalry? Would he not class them as one body of Churches, the Churches of the Province, and appeal to them as "members of the Province Galatia." There was no other unity except that of Christian by which he could designate them. They lived in different countries, they sprang from different races. The one thing in which they were united was as members of the Empire, and their status in the Empire was as members of the Province, *i.e. Galatae*.

But when I pointed out that this term *Galatae* was the only common name by which Paul could address the four

Churches, some North-Galatian critics replied that there was no reason why Paul should sum up the four Churches in a common name. Surely that argument misses the character of the situation; it was urgently needful to sum them up as one body by one common name, recognised equally by all the four Churches.

The word *φόντοι*, introduced in most MSS. after *φθόνοι*, has been rightly rejected by many modern editors relying on its omission in the Vatican and Sinaitic and some less important MSS. It spoils the picture, and is merely a scribe's reminiscence of *Romans* i. 29.

3. Faults connected with the society and manners of the Græco-Asiatic cities. These are two—drinkings, revellings.

No comment is needed. The remains of the later Greek comedy, and the paintings on Greek vases, show how characteristic and universal such revels were in the Greek cities. Komos, the Revel, was made a god, and his rites were carried on quite systematically, and yet with all the ingenuity and inventiveness of the Greek mind, which lent perpetual novelty and variety to the revellings. The Komos was the most striking feature in Greek social life. Though we are too absolutely ignorant of the Græco-Phrygian society to be able to assert that this Greek custom flourished there, yet it is highly probable that those who adopted Greek manners and civilization adopted that characteristic feature, the Komos. It is too often the case that the vices of civilization are the first elements in it to affect the less civilized races when brought into contact with it.

Thus the second and third classes of faults belong specially to the Hellenizing section of Phrygian society, springing from the too rapid and indiscriminate assimilation of Greek ideas and Greek freedom. The first class of faults was most characteristic of the less progressive section

of society, the old native party. Both sections, doubtless, were represented in the young Churches; at any rate the faults were always blazoned before their eyes (*φανερὰ*), and the customs of society are apt to exercise a strong influence on all persons unless they are on their guard.

L. VI. 1-5.

The opening paragraph of chapter vi. is occupied still with the same subject as the last two. Paul is looking quite away from the Judaic controversy. He is absorbed in the development of his own Churches and the special faults that they have to face. He saw one serious danger in that Anatolian people, easy-tempered and orderly in most things, but capable of going to any extreme in religious madness. Just as in later time, "that unpitying Phrygian sect" was apt to cry—

Him can no fount of fresh forgiveness lave
Who sins, once washed by the baptismal wave—

so already Paul saw their tendency to unforgiving condemnation of him who had sinned, and warned them, "Brethren, even if a man be overtaken in any trespass, restore such a one in a spirit of meekness." To continue the quotation—

She sighed,
The infant Church! Of love she felt the tide
Stream on her from her Lord's yet recent grave.

And so Paul's Epistle to the Galatians is an outline of Phrygian Christian history: he saw what was the one safeguard for his young Churches, and he urges it on them, in paragraph after paragraph—Love.

And what have the North-Galatian theorists to say in illustration of this most characteristically Phrygian passage? Why, they are struck with the fact that a man in Corinth had committed a grave offence; Paul's appeal to

the Corinthian brethren to punish the offender "had been promptly and zealously responded to"; and "he had even to interpose for the pardon of the guilty one." And therefore "the remembrance of this incident still fresh on his mind, may be supposed to have dictated the injunction" to the Galatians here. Because the Corinthians had been severe, therefore the Gauls must be warned not to be severe!

But that is not Paul's method. When he warns the Galatians against a fault, it is not because the Corinthians had committed it, but because the Galatians were prone to it. If in any of his Epistles Paul is wholly absorbed in the needs of his first audience, it is in this to the Galatians. But so it was in all, more or less, with the exception of *Romans*; he speaks to the Church in Rome, not from personal knowledge, nor from report of their special circumstances (as to the Colossians), but in preparation for his own visit and from his experience in the Eastern Churches.

In the first four and a half chapters Paul is occupied specially in revivifying in the Galatians the impressions and the teaching of the first journey; from v. 13 onwards he is repeating the warnings that we can imagine formed the burden of his preaching on the second journey. But everywhere he feels himself on Anatolian soil, and is speaking to a typically Anatolian, and in particular a Phrygian, people; and the best preparation for studying the adaptation of his words to his readers is to study the typical peasant of the present day, as he presents him to the travellers that have observed himself with sympathy and affection. He is called an Osmanli now—he does not call himself a Turk, and rather resents the name—but he has much of the old Phrygian character.

ADDITION TO § XLII.

I HAVE insisted, both in *St. Paul the Traveller* (p. 97 f.) and in the *EXPOSITOR*, July, 1899 (p. 23), on the remarkable analogy between the expression used by Paul himself to describe one specially prominent accompaniment of his disease—"a stake in the flesh"—and the words which rise to the lips of several persons known to me, all innocent of Pauline prepossession, in describing their own experience of the headache that accompanies each recurrence of chronic malaria fever—"a red-hot bar thrust through the forehead." In corroboration of this, I may quote the description of "a bad attack of malarial neuralgia," given by the South African author, A. Werner, on p. 236 of his collection of stories, entitled *The Captain of the Locusts*, 1899. He speaks of "the grinding, boring pain in one temple, like the dentist's drill—the phantom wedge driven in between the jaws," and describes the acuteness of the suffering, in which every minute the patient seems to have "reached the extreme point of human endurance."

Is it possible to have more convincing analogies than this? A similar metaphor rises to the lips of quite independent persons to describe the sensation. There are perhaps some who may think it wrong procedure to imagine that Paul was really describing with what they might brand as morbid anatomical detail the exact species of pain that he suffered. I think Paul was not so different from the ordinary human being that he must describe his enemy in the flesh only by some general and vague expression. Every one who has to contend often with any special enemy of this kind, if he speaks of it at all, tends to use some phrase about it that reveals his own personal experience. Commonly he is silent about it; but if he is deeply moved, and alludes to it while he is showing his inmost

soul under the stimulus of emotion, his expression lights up by a flash the physical fact.

That is the case in 2 *Corinthians* xii. 7. There is no passage in all Paul's writings in which he is more deeply moved. There is no other passage in which he shows so much of his inner mind, or speaks so freely of his private personal experiences. He alludes, among these experiences, to his secret communing with the Divine nature; and he describes the counter-balancing evil at once an extremely painful, almost unendurable, suffering, and a serious impediment to his work. These are the two features about this enemy in the flesh, on which the human being is sure to insist. It is "a stake in the flesh,—a messenger of Satan," the enemy of the truth.

When we take this striking realistic detail in conjunction with the strong and very old tradition that Paul was in this expression describing the pain of headache, it seems to me that there is an exceedingly strong case, such as one could hardly have expected about such a matter. And this is clinched by the well-attested superstition current in Asia Minor that this affliction was the special weapon hurled by the gods of the underworld against criminals.

W. M. RAMSAY.

APOCALYPTIC SKETCHES.

VII.

THE SEVEN VIALS.

REV. XV., XVI.

WE have now reached the series in which "is finished the wrath of God." We shall find it compressed into a single chapter (xvi.). One reason why it can be brought into such brief compass is that there is no episode between the sixth and seventh as in former series; but we have something corresponding to it in the special vision of consolation in chapter xv. 2-4. There seems good reason for finding it on this occasion at the beginning instead of between the sixth and seventh. The seventh seal was to open out into a series of seven trumpets, hence the vision of consolation before it; and again the seventh trumpet was to open out into a series of seven vials, so that again we have a heartening in advance; but the seventh vial has no further series in it, for it is the close of all. We need not wonder, therefore, that the consolatory vision should be found, not between the sixth and seventh in this case, but in the opening of the entire series. Hence the pause and the break between verses 1 and 2 of this chapter.

These reassuring visions are always anticipatory. They are addressed to the hope of the seer and the saints. They are intended to show what is to be the final outcome of the judgments which in the prophecy they introduce. In the great vision of the Throne of God and of the Lamb before the opening of the first series (iv., v.) we hear the song of the Elders and the living creatures, and the angels, and the whole creation of God. In the vision of the sealing between the sixth and seventh seal (vii.) we see "a great multitude whom no man can number

out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation, standing before the throne clothed in white robes and palms in their hands." In the vision of the measuring between the sixth and seventh trumpet (xi. 1-13) we see the two witnesses whose dead bodies had lain dishonoured in the street of the great city where their Lord was crucified, raised like Him from the dead, and like Him ascending into heaven in a cloud of glory. In the vision of the Lamb upon Mount Zion (xiv.) we hear again the harpers harping with their harps, and the glad music of the new song, and later on behold (14-16) the Son of Man coming on a white cloud to gather in the great harvest of the world. In every case we are carried right on beyond all the intervening darkness and trouble to the glorious consummation. So is it once more in the opening of this catastrophic vision of the seven vials; we see on to the very close of the mighty conflict, and hear the song of the victors beside the glassy sea. Again, as before, the last is first and the first is last—we first catch a glimpse of the end and then go through the dark tunnel which leads to it. It will suit us on this occasion to take the order of time; so we shall reserve the splendours of the 15th chapter till we shall have dealt with the horrors of the 16th.

Once more, in dealing with the vials, the first thing to observe is the close correspondence with the foregoing series, especially with the series of trumpets which immediately precedes it. In all the three there is the same two-fold division into four and three, four dealing specially with the visible, and three with the invisible. As in the first four trumpets, so in the first four vials, judgment is represented as falling successively on the earth or land (v. 2), the sea (v. 3), the rivers and fountains (4-7), the sun (8, 9), the only material difference being the suggestion of increased severity. In the series of the seals it was the

fourth part (vi. 8) that was smitten, in the trumpets the third part (viii. 7-11), in the vials it is the whole. In the remaining three there is also an evident correspondence with the trumpet series; for "the throne of the beast," on which the fifth vial was poured (10), corresponds to "the pit of the abyss" in the fifth trumpet, the result in each case being not death but pain, torment, to the worshippers of the dragon and the beast; the fifth vial was poured out on the river Euphrates (12), the very same spot where in the sixth trumpet the four angels were set loose; and in each case this is followed by the gathering of the hosts of the Unseen to a terrible battle; the seventh vial was poured out upon the air (17); and here, as when the seventh trumpet sent forth its blast, there are voices in heaven, and thunders and lightnings, and terrible hail. The correspondence throughout is therefore exceedingly close.

Thus we have proof after proof, as we read on in this wonderful book, that those are entirely astray who try to make it a chart of the world's history mapped out beforehand to satisfy curiosity concerning the "times or seasons which the Father hath set within His own authority," and which the Lord Himself told His disciples it was not for them to know (Acts i. 7). Suppose, for example, we can find a series of events in the history of the early Roman Empire to correspond with the seven seals—which, as we have seen, is not difficult, for it was that particular epoch in which the seer and his readers were living, and we found, as a matter of fact, that the correspondence was very close—and that later on we could light upon another series as closely corresponding to the former as the trumpets correspond to the seals, say in the middle ages, which can be done only by the most fanciful interpretation of the trumpets on the one hand, and the most violent dealing with history on the other—does any

reasonable person suppose that still a third series could be discovered, say in modern history, which would follow the same exact succession of plagues—first on the land, then on the sea, then on the rivers, then on the sun, then on the throne of the beast, then on the Euphrates, and finally on the air? Of course God can do everything; and it would be quite possible for Him to arrange the history of the world in successive cycles of seven, as closely corresponding to one another as the seals and trumpets and vials; but has He done it? Most certainly He has not. That history repeats itself is most true, but that the repetition is in any such mechanical fashion is a delusion. It certainly does not repeat itself point after point in clearly marked cycles of seven.

It is surely, therefore, most evident that these successive series have all the same application; they are all coloured by the events of the time, as well as cast in the mould of the familiar prophetic imagery of the past; they all deal with the great issues then impending, and yet they are applicable to the course of Divine Providence right on through all the centuries to the very end; for the same forces will appear and reappear, and the same conflict will be waged over and over again, generation after generation; the same issue will be reached as each generation of the redeemed joins the great multitude whom no man can number, and in all the centuries, right on to the end of the world, events will tend towards the same grand consummation of which we have so many glowing pictures in this great Apocalypse, when time shall be no longer, and all discords shall be resolved into the heavenly harmony of the new song. As in the case of the trumpets following the seals, so in the case of the vials following the trumpets, we have not another reach of history brought into the field of a great telescope, but another turn of the marvellous kaleidoscope, showing the same objects in new combinations.

From all this it follows that it is quite beside the mark to raise the question when or where or between what European or other powers shall be fought the battle of Armageddon. Har-magedon, or the Hill of Megiddo, was the most famous battlefield of the Old Testament. There Barak gained his great victory over the Canaanites (Judg. iv. and v.), and there Gideon defeated the Midianites (Judg. vii.); there Saul perished at the hand of the Philistines (1 Sam. xxxi. 8), and there King Josiah, who had joined the forces of the Assyrian monarch against Pharaoh Necho, King of Egypt, was defeated and slain by the Egyptian archers. Armageddon, therefore, was a name which would rise as readily to the lips of a Hebrew as Thermopylæ to a Greek, or Waterloo to an Englishman. The use of it would have the effect of conjuring up to the mind in the most impressive possible way the thought of fierce contending hosts. All this does not mean that there will never be a battle of Armageddon; rather it means that there may be many. There have been Armageddons in the centuries that are past since the words of this prophecy were written, and we greatly fear that we are not done with them yet.

So much for the correspondences with the preceding series; we must now call attention to the new features which emerge, the new aspects which come before us, in the final series.

First, then, as to the manner in which the series is opened. In the opening of the seals (vi.) there was the fourfold invitation from the four living creatures, each one successively calling, "Come." In the opening of the trumpet vision (viii.) there was an impressive silence of half an hour, during which the prayer-angel advanced with his golden censer to the altar of incense. In the third there is greater solemnity and impressiveness, and a combination of the former accessories with features entirely

new. As in the first series, we have the appearance of one of the living creatures; as in the second, we have the solemn movement of the angels; but the new feature is the advance from the outer court of creation, as represented by the four living creatures in the opening of the seals, and from the holy place as represented by the prayer-angel with his golden censer in the opening of the trumpets, on and in, to the inner shrine of the Divine presence, as indicated by the opening of the temple¹ in Heaven, the issuing of the seven angels from the inner shrine, and the voice of command coming from the same sanctuary now filled with smoke.² All this certainly betokens increased solemnity; but does it not also suggest that judgment is coming, not upon the world only, but on the Church? And this is still further indicated by the priestly vestments of the seven angels (v. 6). In the seals the judgment is represented simply as coming on the world. The only place the Church has in that first series is where the souls are seen under the altar, and heard crying out, "How long, O Master, the holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" In the second series we found a discrimination between the faithful and the unfaithful, and directions given in the vision of the measuring to leave out "the court which is without the temple" (xi. 2); and in the visions which follow the trumpets and lead up to the vials special attention is called to those who, instead of the seal of God on their foreheads, exhibit the mark of the beast. Now observe that in this third series it is on those faithless ones who have allowed themselves to be so branded that the judgment is represented specially as falling (v. 2). Not that the judgment of the vials is confined to the unfaithful ones in the Church; it is, like all the rest, a series of woes

¹ Not *ιερόν*, but *ναός*=inner shrine.

² See the whole passage, xv. 5-xvi. 1.

coming on the earth, but it is significant that there is this singling out for special mention of those who bear the mark of the beast. And the same thought, of judgment coming on the House of God, is strikingly suggested in the solemn warning (v. 15): "Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame."

We might give, as still another indication of this, the reference to Babylon; but, in order to bring this out, it would be necessary to deal with a large and difficult subject we have not yet touched, and which will be more conveniently dealt with in our next paper on the fall of Babylon, as described in the 17th and 18th chapters.

Now that we have observed the special reference of the vials of judgment to those who have succumbed to the temptations of the ungodly and wicked world, we can see how beautifully appropriate is the vision of consolation (xv. 2-4) with which the series is specially introduced, and the consideration of which we postponed till we had looked at the great tribulation through which the victors had to pass.

This is one of those magnificent passages which bring us within hearing of the music of heaven. It is therefore dangerous to touch. Yet it may help us to see a little more of its marvellous beauty, if attention is given to some of the special features of this Hallelujah Chorus.

"The sea of glass mingled with fire"—what is this? Twelve years ago, in the beautiful month of May, I was sailing in the *Ægean* Sea. It was towards evening of a glorious day, and the sun was nearing the western horizon. The sea was a vast level plain, lightly ruffled by a gentle breeze, and shining in the splendour of the setting sun, making that innumerable laughter of the wavelets, the picture of which has been painted by a great Greek poet in a miniature of three words which will never die. The

angle at which the westering sun fell on these innumerable wavelets was such that every concave mirror over all the plain was aflame. And the general effect was very striking. Neither before nor since have I seen such a resplendent example of what mineralogists call the vitreous lustre, extending over the entire plain of the sea. It was a *glassy sea*. It was a glassy sea *mingled with fire*. I have seen many grand visions of nature in my day, but none, not even the Nebelmeer on the Swiss mountains, to compare with this. I have no doubt John saw it often, and I certainly do not wonder that it should find an honoured place once and again in this grand Apocalypse. The sea was no friend of John's. It was to him a symbol of estrangement, separation, tumult, darkness, and wild commotion, a raging deep from which his awful beast emerges; and all this impresses him so, that among his most characteristic utterances concerning the glory of the better land is this, "The sea is no more." But a poet such as he could not be indifferent to the beauty of the sea in its quieter aspects, especially when lighted up with the glory of the sun; and fond of contrasts as he was, we can understand how his natural aversion to the sea would make him only the more eager to show that even out of its horrors the Almighty can bring beauty to grace Heaven itself. And as he had been lately representing the dragon standing on the sand of the sea, and watching the hideous monster emerge from the waste of its waves, he will now represent the conquerors of the dragon and the beast standing on the shore, of the same sea perhaps, now no seething waste of waves, but a sea of glory, a sea of glass mingled with fire: judgment and mercy met together, righteousness and peace embracing each other, the fire of judgment adding glory to the glassy sea.

But why does he bring in the sea at all? If he desires a complete contrast, why does he not choose for his image

some pleasant plain with a river making it glad, as he does later on, when, after doing away with "the salt, unplumbed, estranging sea," he shows us the river of the water of life flowing from the Throne of God. It is because he has in view the hosts of Israel of old singing their song of victory on the placid banks of the great sea through whose angry, threatening waters they had safely passed. That old song of Moses will be taken up and blended with the new song of those who have followed the Lamb and share His victory, when, after the seals of God have all been broken, the trumpet blasts of vengeance all stilled into silence, and the vials of wrath empty for evermore, the throng of the redeemed shall gather on the eternal shore, and sing the song of Moses and the Lamb: "Great and marvellous are Thy works, O Lord, the Almighty; righteous and true are Thy ways, Thou King of the ages. Who shall not fear, O Lord, and glorify Thy name? For Thou only art holy; for all the nations shall come and worship before Thee, for Thy righteous acts have been made manifest."

Holy, holy, holy, all the saints adore Thee,
Casting down their golden crowns around the glassy sea,
Cherubim and Seraphim falling down before Thee,
Which wert, and art, and evermore shalt be.

Wilt thou share that victory and join in that new song?
Then see that there be on thee no mark of the beast, see
that thou be sealed with the seal of God on thy forehead!

J. MONRO GIBSON.

THE DOCTRINES OF GRACE.

VI.

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD.

CERTAIN doctrines of the Christian faith may be called Catholic because they are held by the whole Church of Christ throughout all her branches and amid all her controversies. They are so distinctly a part of Divine revelation and so inextricably woven into the experiences of the soul that to deny them were almost profane, and to ignore them is spiritual paralysis. Prominent in this class stands the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ and His atoning sacrifice upon the Cross, from which doctrines the Church has departed at her peril, in which abiding she always triumphs. Any body of Christians which has denied the one or the other has gradually lost spiritual power, as when the sap returns to the trunk and the branches wither away; the history of the Christian Church bears witness alike to the vitalizing power of these doctrines and the death which befalls all who deny them. Certain doctrines, again, may be called provincial because they are held by some branches only of the one spiritual Church of Christ, and are overlooked or denied by others. No doubt they have their sanction in Holy Scripture, else they had never been accepted by saints and scholars, but their evidence is not so overwhelming as to compel general conviction. They have their vindication also in the experience of the soul, but they are not universal in their hold. An excellent illustration of this kind is the dogma of election, which has been more or less firmly held by the Puritan, and more or less distinctly denied by the Roman, pole of Christian thought, and which—sometimes for weal—the firm consolation of robust spirits, sometimes for woe—the bitter anxiety of those that were bowed down—has wielded an

irresistible influence on those who lived within the memory of this generation.

There is a fashion in doctrine, and it may be frankly admitted that the majestic conception of Divine sovereignty has fallen on evil days, because it has either become obsolete, or it has been turned into a reproach. Letters have always had their quarrel with this ancient faith from the days of the humanists, who saw its shadow cast over the careless gaiety of life in the period of the Renaissance; and in our time, notwithstanding the grim assistance of Carlyle, a Scot saturated with the Shorter Catechism, this doctrine has been unstrung and lost its grip in the pagan atmosphere of our strongest living poets and novelists. The rebirth of the Fatherhood of God in the theology of Maurice, and in the early books of George MacDonald, powerfully affected the religious mind, and alienated it from this doctrine as it had been stated in past centuries. This revolt found an ally also in the teaching of pious but unlearned evangelists, who, it may be said without uncharitable reflection, did not perhaps grasp this doctrine, and who certainly judged it expedient to let the Divine decrees severely alone, and, instead of explaining the Will of God, to make their direct and affectionate appeal to the souls of men. Without recantation or explanation, the Puritan pulpit has quietly allowed the doctrine to fall into the background, so that Mr. Spurgeon was the last preacher of the grand order to declare it without apology and to apply it to the upbuilding of faith, while a young modern would as soon think of discussing the identity of the Lost Ten Tribes as choosing election for the subject of a sermon. Persons of unblemished faith who would on no account deny or belittle what they regard as a truth of Holy Scripture, prefer that it should be kept in reserve, partly because it is one of the deep things of God which they do not hope to understand, partly because its treatment in the past has

not been always for the comfort of the soul. One does not exaggerate, therefore, in saying that election is a forgotten and an opprobrious doctrine.

What this doctrine was in the days of its royalty there is little doubt, for men were not afraid to declare it or to place its meaning upon permanent record. Of course there were differences in the accidents of the doctrine, but none in its essence. Some stalwarts of unflinching logic might hold that the purpose of election preceded creation in order of thought, so that men were virtually called into existence by the will of God in order to be saved or in order to be damned—which is surely the furthest reach of merciless reason within the range of human thought. Other divines of more fearful mind considered that the purpose of election followed the Fall in order of thought so that from among those who had merited death God of His good pleasure called some unto life, and in this way they were understood to conserve the goodness of God, which at any rate had saved a few out of a multitude, which otherwise would all have perished. It might be also debated whether the sacrifice of Christ had reference only to the elect or whether its overflowing benefits blessed the outer circle of the non-elect with uncovenanted mercies; whether the offer of the Divine mercy ought to be made only to the few who were already in the purposes of God or whether the preacher might not be justified in extending this offer to all his hearers. Upon those points of speculation there were keen arguments, which to-day would be an anachronism, but which only proved to us the insatiable love of our fathers for metaphysical reasoning. But on the main subject of the doctrine there was absolute agreement. For any one to teach that God, foreseeing those who should afterwards believe, elected them on that account unto salvation or that any one co-operated with the Divine Spirit in the work of salvation, was flagrant and unreasonable heresy. There

were points of distinction within the outer frontiers of the doctrine, but the doctrine in any case stood fast with sharp, clear-cut outlines that God of His own will, and for no reason in themselves, called some to life and left others to death, and that according to the decrees of God it would happen to them, do as they pleased, in this world and that which is to come.

As soon as this doctrine is stated one can understand how it came to excite such fierce antipathy and why it was placed more frequently than any other doctrine in the pillory of literature. It cannot be stated, however softened and disguised, without not only exposing itself to the criticism of reason, but also goading the moral sense into unflinching opposition. Not only has Calvinism laid itself open to satiric wit, which has ever played freely upon it, but it has also excited hot indignation because on the face of things this action of the Eternal seems to be so unfair, so arbitrary, so ungenerous—the policy not of a gracious sovereign but of an irresponsible despot. No earthly parent dare cast so many of the children whom he has begotten upon the streets to starve and to perish, and cherish so many in his home, showering upon them the riches of his goodness, while he might have done well by them all. Any parent who should give such an illustration of partiality and injustice would be called to account, not only by public opinion, but by the laws of his country, and he could not escape in any case without earning disgrace and punishment. Is it not reasonable to argue that what would be unbecoming an earthly father is utterly impossible with God, and what would be worthy of the father of our flesh will be surpassed beyond our imagination by the Father of our spirit?

Besides—and this is a very damning reflection on any doctrine—was not this belief in the irresponsibility and sovereignty of God calculated to have an injurious and

immoral effect alike upon those who were His beneficiaries and those who were His victims? Could anything be more certain to fill the human heart with pride and to make charity impossible than the conviction that God had chosen, say, a single people from among all the nations of the world, and had made with them a covenant of love, so that He became their God and they became His family, while the other nations of the world were left in darkness and in the shadow of death? The Hebrew prophets had to contend at every turn with the intense and bitter fanaticism of their nation, which made its boast in God and despised all other men; and, on the other hand, no doctrine more utterly destroyed hope in the breasts of those who were outside its range than the belief that for them God took no care, and for them He had no love. It mattered not how such outcasts prayed, nor what they did, they could never enter in by the door into the Father's house, and never could receive anything but unconsidered fragments of the Divine Goodness—thrown to them in the outer place as broken meat is cast unto the dogs. Was it not the case in our Lord's day that this sense of rejection and reprobation weighed heavily upon the minds of social pariahs and confirmed them in their sin and in their despair? It seemed, indeed, as if God were only a larger Pharisee sitting alone with fellow-Pharisees while they wandered on the highways uncared for and forsaken, and laid themselves down under the hedges to die unpitied and unregarded.

Before, however, any person refuses to consider this doctrine on the ground that it contradicts the necessary equality of all men before God he ought to ask whether there is any such equality to be found, and whether there is not rather a very manifest inequality. It is always easy to sit in one's arm-chair and to condemn this doctrine because it enshrines partiality, but it would be well to go out into life and discover the evidence of impartiality. As

a matter of fact the circumstances of life are no less perplexing than the idea of election, and this doctrine, like many another which is supposed to be unjust, may turn out to be in close contact with human life. It is unreasonable to blame theologians for insisting that God made distinctions, and to accuse them of a perverse imagination, when one has only to look outside to see that this very imagination is in action over the whole world. If it be indeed an axiom embedded in the best instincts of human nature that God makes no difference between one of his children and another, then this axiom is never argued in practical life, for the whole doctrine of election in its most pronounced form is an acting principle of history.

Is it not the case that one nation stood out from amongst all others as the chosen of the Almighty, and was endowed with singular privileges which other nations would have desired, and of which this nation was by no means worthy? With their ancient calling, their remarkable revelations, their unique order of prophets, their historical deliverances, their absolute isolation, their overflowing energy, their indomitable faith, the Jews have been, and remain unto this day, the unanswerable evidence of Divine election. What is true of Israel is equally true of England, which has been girt about by the sea and has received a clear knowledge of the Evangel, and has been distinctly succoured in straits of the national history, and has been endued with power unto the ends of the earth, and has received the gift of government of an undeniable kind, and all this, as any one can see, for great and righteous ends. Compare the light of the Jews with the gross darkness of the Gentiles, the civilization of England with the barbarism of an African people. Take the west end of a city, with its brightness, its culture, its luxury, and its pleasure; take the east end, crowded, squalid, hard-driven, agonized, and who is prepared to hold the scales of this contrast and to estimate its moral mean-

ing? And between two brothers of the same family what an inequality of ability, temper, appearance, physique! This variety of lot so extreme, so irresistible, so unmerited, is either the result of blind, inexorable law, or it is the effect of living, conscious will. We are either caught in the coils of material and social forces from which we cannot escape and which are practically omnipotent, or we are the subjects of intelligent and personal government; and behind all laws, and, if you please, behind clouds of darkness, God Himself is reigning.

And if Life, being summoned as a witness for the prosecution, unexpectedly affords evidence in the defence of sovereignty, neither is this archaic doctrine so utterly contradicted by the conclusions of modern theology. Without doubt one of the finest achievements in the range of dogma has been the rediscovery of the Divine Fatherhood, and no doubt this most living faith has been often used to impugn Divine sovereignty. It has seemed, indeed, to many minds a truism that if we believe in the Fatherhood of God, we must cease to believe in His sovereignty; and yet ought it not to be evidence, to a thoughtful person, that if one is discussing authority, that of a judge is nothing compared with that of a father. The judge is only able to try certain cases which are placed before him, and beyond the evidence of the case he cannot go. His power over the person at the bar is limited to the person's acts, and to those few acts that have been brought under his survey. Within the family the father takes to do not only with action but also with motives. He regulates at his pleasure the affairs of his household, and assigns to each his lot, with whom none may dispute, against whom none may rebel. He is not bound to give any reasons, nor does he refer to any statutes; indeed, for practical purposes, he acts as if he were omniscient and almighty. No sovereign of earth has power so absolute, none is so unfettered in his government, as a

father. The Fatherhood of God does not contradict His sovereignty, but it in reality rehabilitates and regenerates the idea, giving to it an even wider range, and investing it with a more tender character.

No doctrine which has at any time gripped the reason and inflamed the heart of any considerable body of Christian people can slip from the religious consciousness and be neglected in the teaching of truth without serious loss. Such doctrines do not die, they only sleep, and the resuscitation of this sublime conception would be very seasonable in our own time. It is not wonderful that the Roman Church has always regarded it with suspicion and has recognised in it a dangerous intellectual foe, for no idea has ever been such a certain safeguard against the priestly theory of salvation which would practically limit the covenanted mercy of God to a particular Church, and conveyance of grace to certain sacraments. If any one believes that the favour of God has rested in intention upon a man, not only before there was any church, but before he himself came into being, then it surely follows that that favour will not be frustrated and that man miss salvation because he does not happen to belong to a particular branch of Christ's Church, or because he has not been able to avail himself of the sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord. No accident of geography or of training will be allowed to bring to naught the sovereign grace of God, but that grace will rest upon the man unto salvation even although he never had the ministrations of an ordained priest and never had the benefit of a single sacrament. Nor is there any doctrine so likely to guard good but foolish men from religious extravagances and irreverent sensationalism as the profound conviction that they stand ever before His awful majesty, Who doeth as it seemeth good to Him in heaven above and on the earth beneath. Surely it would not be possible for preachers to present the message

of the Divine Love in such unworthy and offensive shapes if they had realized the austere grandeur of the doctrine of election.

If, however, this doctrine is once more to assert itself and to lay claim to something of its former dominion, it must appear in a new dress and be relieved of certain unfortunate additions. Men's minds must not again be driven to the verge of unreason by that futile and exasperating controversy about the relation of the will of God and the will of men. The logic of theology is strong, and, joining hands with material science, it may be able to prove that we have no freedom in life, but are quite helpless before irresistible forces—the mere plaything of necessity. But conscience has surely some value; and if we are sure of anything, it is that we can choose—can harden our hearts against the Divine Love or can open the same hearts to the Elect One of God as He knocketh in His Grace and in His Beauty. It is time also to declare without any hesitation that God does not will that any one should die, which is stark blasphemy; and that He does not withhold from any one the means of life, which were simply treachery; but that He on His part willeth all to live, and that He has done all in His power to accomplish this most worthy end. If any one be saved, as an ancient Father has it, unto God shall be all the praise: if any one perishes, on him alone shall be all the blame. He that liveth shall owe his life to the Grace of God, and he that dieth shall die in spite of the love of God the Father, and the virtue of the atoning sacrifice of the Son, and the patient and pleading grace of the Holy Ghost.

If it should still be urged that God has favoured one man above another, it ought to be pointed out that this action of God need not mean reprobation, but may only mean an order of salvation. It has been too lightly taken for granted that where God specially blessed a man in former days He

had done so to the detriment of all others, and that the end of the Divine blessing was exhausted in the man himself. Is it not far more credible, and was not this the teaching of the Hebrew prophets, that when God gave a man special privileges it was not that other men might suffer loss and he be tempted to boast, but rather that on him should be laid a deeper responsibility, and that through him other men might be saved. There are two ways of conveying the blessing of civilization to a strange country, and it is for the rulers to judge which will best serve their purposes. All the privileges of citizenship may be conferred upon the inhabitants of that country at once and without reserve, in which case it is to be feared that those privileges would be wasted, and might in the end turn into a curse; or certain of its inhabitants, of quick intelligence and susceptible disposition, might be selected and carefully trained that, after their education was completed and they had understood the principles of social order, they might be missionaries and teachers to their own country. After the same fashion the Eternal might have sent the Gospel of His grace on equal terms to all nations of the world at an early date of history, but surely in that case the Gospel had not been understood and would have been trampled under foot. His plan was rather to select a single nation with a genius for religion and through the centuries to train them in the knowledge of His character and in the consciousness of His goodwill, so that at an appointed time that nation might give to a whole world the good news of salvation. Had the Eternal chosen the Jews in order to condemn the Gentiles, then He had been a despot. When He chose the Jews in order to save the Gentiles, He was a Sovereign. Divine sovereignty is not a freak of despotism, but a principle of administration, which is a selection without reprobation, so that Abraham is chosen not that a world may be cast out, but that a world may be blessed in him. With a

perverted sense of Divine sovereignty the Jewish people were apt to insist that they were the favoured of God without regard to moral character or public service, and so they became insolent, but again and again their prophets declared that because they had been chosen they were on that account bound unto holiness; that if they departed from the Law of God, they of all nations would be most heavily punished; and also that if they had received immense benefits, they were holding the same in trust for the world. Whosoever, therefore, has any advantage in this world, either because he knows more or because he possesses more, is so far elect. He is therefore called upon first of all to bless God with fear and trembling, since the responsibility of his trust is so enormous, and next to serve his fellow-men with all faithfulness and with all his might.

Belief in Divine sovereignty bears several fruits which are not over-abundant in our day; for one thing, it creates a majestic view of God and this lies at the root of becoming and reverent religion. The unconscious irreverence of certain forms of religion in our day and the flabbiness of religious faith spring from inadequate conceptions of the power and righteousness of God. When one believes with the marrow of his bones that at the heart of the universe God reigns Almighty, All-Righteous, All-Wise, and All-Loving, then he has a worthy object of faith and a strong ground for prayer and a good hope of salvation. He is able to possess his soul in patience because he knows that above the fret and turmoil of this present life God is doing His Will and accomplishing His purposes; and in his own straits and dangers he has in God a refuge and a hiding-place. The greatest reinforcements which religion could have in our time would be a return to the ancient belief in the sovereignty of God.

This belief, as it creates a majestic God, also makes strong men. One might conclude, if he knew not the fact, but

were only arguing by theory, that minds dominated by this doctrine would be weakened by superstition or cramped by fanaticism. It has, however, rather come to pass that the thinkers who have dared to make their way to the origin of things and to search into the mysteries of grace have been the most virile in the history of the Church. Whatever be his own opinions no one can deny that in the annals of philosophy there has been no acuter mind than Jonathan Edwards and none more influential in theology than John Calvin. And in the conduct of life this august doctrine has been the mother, not of hypocrites and slaves, as some would have us to believe, but of saints and heroes. If it tamed a man's spiritual pride and laid him helpless at the feet of God, it cast on him the awful responsibility of holiness and it sent him forth God's freeman. There was only one thing this man feared, and that was to sin; only one being before whom he trembled, and that was the Eternal. The Puritan feared God with all his soul, and this exhausted his capacity for fear. The face of man he did not fear. What was man, even though he be a king, compared with the King of kings? What mattered it what any man could do to him within whose soul God had spoken peace? Before the battles of the Civil War in England the Cavaliers of Prince Rupert drank and sang, being gay and gallant gentlemen. Before the same battles the Puritans spent the night in prayer and reading of Holy Scripture, being, as it was then considered, fools and fanatics. Pity the Cavaliers in their brave array when the Ironsides charged next morning with their battle cry, "The Sword of the Lord and Gideon." This iron and invincible faith has hated iniquity, broken tyranny, wrought righteousness, and achieved liberty. Witness its rolls of names, each one associated with the vindication of national freedom—John Knox, Oliver Cromwell, the founders of the Dutch Republic, and the fathers of New England. Hear the testimony of a

man not prejudiced in favour of Calvinism, or indeed of faith; "The Calvinists attracted to their ranks almost every man in Western Europe that hated a lie. They were crushed down, but they rose again. They had many faults; let him that is without sin cast a stone at them. They abhorred, as no body of men ever abhorred, all conscious mendacity, all impurity, all moral wrong of every kind, so far as they could recognise it. Whatever exists at this moment in England and Scotland of conscientiousness and fear of doing evil is the remnant of the convictions which were branded by the Calvinists into the people's heart."

And this faith has created a very tender religion in the case of its best children, whether Hebrew Prophets or Puritan saints. They who suppose that pious Calvinists have as a class been proud and hard, know not the men nor their writings. They have not read Archbishop Leighton or Samuel Rutherford, John Bunyan or Richard Baxter. If any man is saved by his own hand—his goodness, his works, or his faith—then is he lifted up to heaven, and none can bear him; but if one honestly believes that from first to last he owes all to the Grace of God in Jesus Christ, he is filled with humility. His is an awful conception of salvation, but the awfulness is shot through with a love which passeth knowledge. His election was not an act of arbitrary will, it was an act of personal grace. Before the world stood he was in the heart of God, and in the covenant of redemption; God gave Him into the charge of His Son. For him and such as him was this world created and the history of mankind arranged. Unto him do all the promises of the Word travel, for him were all the invitations of the Evangel written. Providence united with grace, that one day, as he went his own way, wilful and heedless, he might be arrested by a great light and see the Lord. For him the Lord was born and was rejected and suffered and died and rose again. When the

great High Priest offered his mediatorial prayer, this man's name was mentioned as it is now daily repeated before the Throne. When the nails were driven through the Saviour's hands, they pierced his name ; and when the spear touched the Saviour's heart, his name, being there first, was the cause thereof, and at this thought his heart also was broken to flow out for ever in love and holiness, in devotion and sacrifice, at the feet of Christ, in whom the election of God stands, and by Whom it must be for ever judged.

JOHN WATSON.

MISREADINGS AND MISRENDERINGS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

III.

B. ERRORS OF INTERPRETATION (*continued*).

IN my preceding or second article,¹ speaking of the Greek Infinitive, as exhibited in the literary and therefore artificial style of classical literature, I stated that even professional writers of that period often resorted to the expedient of resolving the Infinitive into a finite subordinate verb introduced either by *ἵνα* (also by *ὅπως* and *ὥς*), or by *ὅτι* (also by *ὡς*, then later on by *διότι*, *ὡς ὅτι* or *ὡσότι*, and *πῶς*). The former case, that is the "*ἵνα*-analysis, which we called the prospective or final, was then historically investigated and its consequences and effects upon New Testament Greek traced and duly emphasized.

We now proceed to consider the alternative case, when the Infinitive was resolved into *ὅτι* and *ὥς* with their later and amplified by-forms *διότι*, *ὡς ὅτι*, and *πῶς*. As already intimated in the said inquiry, this "*ὅτι*-analysis was limited to the comparatively small number of cases in which the Infinitive depended on such verbs or expressions as indicated a Saying, Thinking, Perceiving, Swearing, and the like,—terms which sometimes go by the collective and technical name of *verba dicendi* (or *declarandi*) *et sentiendi*. It will be convenient to call this Infinitive as well as its "*ὅτι*-analysis the *Recitative*, or rather *Declarative*.

The Declarative Infinitive then, which from the outset had a limited usage, began to retreat before its "*ὅτι*-analysis as early as classical antiquity and considerably earlier than the Prospective Infinitive already discussed. Now in this

¹ See the EXPOSITOR for April last, p. 298 ff.

Declarative analysis the particles resorted to were first and chiefest of all *ὅτι*, then *ὥς*, later on *διότι* (= *ὅτι*), and still later *ὥς ὅτι* (*ὥσότι*) and *πῶς*, all of which were identical in their function and meaning, viz. *that* (German *dass*, French *que*). As regards their history, *ὅτι* has had an unbroken record from Homer down to the present day, *ὥς* and *διότι* played a rather limited and varied part, whereas *ὥς ὅτι* (*ὥσότι*) and *πῶς* (= *ὅτι*) cropped up as colloquial terms in early Græco-Roman times and had a considerable run; as a matter of fact *πῶς* has ever since been in constant use with a steadily increasing popularity; so that in the colloquial speech of to-day it is the regular representative of ancient declarative *ὅτι* and *ὥς* or their equivalent Declarative Infinitive.

To illustrate the preceding exposition, let us take the sentence: *They said THAT he was a good man.* This clause in *classical* literary style would be expressed either by the declarative Infinitive: *οὗτοι ἔλεγον ἀγαθὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι*, or by its declarative analysis through *ὅτι* or *ὥς*, namely: *οὗτοι ἔλεγον ὅτι* (or *ὥς*) *ἀγαθὸς εἶη* or *ἐστίν*. This construction then gradually made room for the post-classical—especially Græco-Roman—*popular* form:

οὗτοι ἔλεγον ὅτι (or *ὥς*, also *διότι*) *ἀγαθὸς ἐστίν* or *ἐνι*,

then for the form:

οὗτοι ἔλεγον (or *ἔλεγαν*) *ὅτι*—also *ὥς ὅτι* or *πῶς*—*ἀγαθὸς ἐστίν* or *ἐνι*.

Accordingly modest or untrained writers who cared not for style but for substance and facts, are now breaking with the hitherto conventional style and largely adopt the *artless*, *plain*, and *DIRECT* mode of expression. This plain and direct style is eminently illustrated in the New Testament compositions, inasmuch as direct speech or *oratio recta* largely preponderates over indirect speech or *oratio*

obliqua. Consequently an unconventional scribe of the Græco-Roman period either used one of the above indirect forms of expression, or rather proceeded indirectly and then suddenly changed indirect to direct speech; so that the above typical sentence assumed the form:

οὗτοι ἔλεγον (ὅτι)· “Ἀγαθός ἐστιν or ἐνι” (cf. John 7, 12); then: αὐτοὶ ἔλεγον (or -γαν) πῶς· “Αὐτὸς ἀγαθός ἐστιν or ἐνι.”

Now if the above particles ὅτι, ὥς, διότι, ὡς ὅτι, πῶς were in every case synonymous, always meaning *that*, there would be no mistake about them in compound or connected sentences. But as each of them has other meanings besides, their contextual function in very many instances becomes ambiguous. Thus πῶς may stand for the adverb πῶς, ‘how,’ and for the conjunction ‘that’; διότι for ‘because’ and for ‘that’; ὥς for ‘that,’ for ‘because,’ for ‘how,’ and for ‘how much’;—while ὅτι may do duty for ‘that’ or for ‘because,’ or it may be a misreading of ὅ,τι (ὅ τι) and so mean ‘that which’; nay, it may even stand for the interrogative τί, and thus mean ‘what’ or ‘why,’ as we shall show in our next paper.

In order to obtain a clear idea of the particular function of these particles in each case and their direct bearing upon New Testament Greek, it will be expedient first to premise a few broad remarks on the use of the particles in general and then to consider the above representatives in their historical development with especial reference to the New Testament language.

If any particular section of Greek grammar were taken as a specimen to illustrate the historical evolution of the Greek language, no better representative could be selected for the purpose than the chapter dealing with the particles. For this class of words shows pre-eminently how those among them which were associated with each other in one or more points gradually resulted in a complete identification or differentiation, each losing its secondary notion;

and how they successively retreated before, or coalesced into, the most expressive or most familiar representative among them. Thus :—

Classical *ἐν*, *εἰς*, and *πρός* have led in modern Greek to *εἰς*; *μετά* and *σύν* to *μετά* (now *μέ*); *ἀπό*, *ἐξ*, *ὑπό* and *παρά*, to *ἀπό*; *ὡς* and *ὅτι* to *ὅτι*; *ὅπως* and *ἵνα* to *ἵνα* (now *νά*).

Such a study further shows how, in many cases, the resultant representative, having once established itself, again began to wear off into a commonplace and weak particle and thus had either to retreat in its turn before some new substitute, or to seek to recover its former force by combining itself with some other synonym. Thus :—

ὡς + *ὅτι* = *ὡς ὅτι* or rather *ὡσότι*;
ὡς + *ἵνα* = *ὡς ἵνα* ,, *ὡσίνα*.

The natural consequence of the above process was that on the one hand the number of particles used anciently has diminished considerably, and on the other those particles which eventually prevailed over their associates and competitors have increased in frequency. In the case of the conjunctions this was also to be expected, seeing that, ever since classical antiquity, the infinitival and participial construction began, as already explained,¹ to make room for finite dependent clauses introduced by the appropriate conjunctions.

The process above delineated may be roughly illustrated by the following particles taken as representative specimens :—

¹ See EXPOSITOR of April last, p. 300.

ASSOCIATED PARTICLES

In <i>Classical Antiquity</i> used concurrently	In <i>Græco-Roman Times</i> reduced to	In <i>Modern Greek</i> reduced to
ἐξ (ἐκ), ἀπό, ὑπό	ἀπό, ἐξ	ἀπό
ἐν, εἰς, πρὸς	εἰς, ἐν	εἰς
μετά, σύν	μετά	(μετά), μέ
εἰ, εἰάν, ἄν, ἤν	εἰ, εἰάν, ἄν	ἄν
ἕως, ἕς, ἕσ τε	ἕως, ὥς ¹	ὥς, ὥσ τε (from ὥς ὅ τε)
ὅπῃ, ὅπου, ὅπου	ὅπου	ὅπου
ὅτι, ὡς, infn.	ὅτι (ὡς, πῶς)	(ὅτι), πῶς
" " "	ὡς ὅτι	πῶς ὅτι, ὅτι πῶς
ὡς, ἵνα, ὅπως, inf. part.	ἵνα	νά
" " " " "	ὡς ἵνα	διὰ νά, ὡς διανά

Now to return to the *declarative* particles or conjunctions ὅτι, ὡς, διότι, ὡς ὅτι, with which we are concerned here, they had, as I have already indicated, a varied and more or less individual history since classical times. In these circumstances, it may prove of interest and use to consider them here separately and as briefly as possible.

1. **ΟΤΙ** : *that* (German *dass*, French *que*).

This particle is far too common and familiar to students to require illustrations here.

2. **ΩΣ** (= ὅτι), *that*.

As already observed, ὡς was an old associate of declarative ὅτι. Though far less common than ὅτι, it was fondly used by certain writers, especially by Thucydides and—what is more significant for us—by Polybios. However, in the course of post-classical times it began to lose ground before its associate and formidable rival ὅτι, and eventually—towards the close of the Græco-Roman period—disappeared

¹ This form ὥς (misaccented ὡς), from and for ἕως, occurs already in the New Testament, as : John (9, 4) ; 12, 35 ὥς (not ὡς) τὸ φῶς ἔχετε, *as long as* (or *while*) ye have the light. Gal. 6, 10 ὥς καιρὸν ἔχομεν, *while* we have time. So too Ignat. ad Smyr. 9, 1 ὥς (ubi male ὡς) ἔτι καιρὸν ἔχομεν.

altogether from the living language. It follows from this that at the time of the New Testament writers, *ὥς* as a declarative particle had not become extinct, as is commonly but erroneously assumed. Thus in Luke 23, 55 *ἐθεάσαντο τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ ὥς ἐτέθη τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ*, i.e. "they saw the tomb and *that* (not 'how') his body had been laid."

Luke 24, 6 *μνήσθητε ὥς ἐλάλησεν ὑμῖν ἔτι ἐν Γαλιλαίᾳ ὡν λέγων*, i.e. "do remember *that* (not 'how') he had preached unto you while he was yet in Galilee saying."

Luke 24, 35 *καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐξηγοῦντο τὰ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ καὶ ὥς ἐγνώσθη αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου*, i.e. "and they narrated what had occurred on the way and *that* (not 'how') it had become known unto them on the occasion of the breaking of the bread."

Acts 10, 28 *ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε ὥς ἀθέμιτόν ἐστιν ἀνδρὶ Ἰουδαίῳ κολλᾶσθαι*, i.e. "ye know yourselves that (surely not 'how,' as the R.V. has it) it is unlawful to associate oneself with a Jew."

Romans 1, 9 *μάρτυς γάρ μου ὁ θεὸς . . . ὥς ἀδιαλείπτως μνεῖαν ὑμῶν ποιούμαι*, i.e. "for God is my witness . . . *that* I constantly remember you in my prayers."

3. ΔΙΟΤΙ (=declarative *ὅτι*): *that*.

This particle, which represents an amplified by-form of *ὅτι*, is very common in post-classical Greek from the third century B.C. onwards down to Byzantine times. However, as it does not seem to occur in the New Testament compositions, we need not discuss its history and usage here.¹

4. ΩΣ ΟΤΙ or ΩΣΟΤΙ (=declarative *ὅτι*): *that*.

As already indicated, *ὥς ὅτι* is an amplified or strengthened form of declarative *ὅτι* (just like later *ὥσῖνα* = *ἵνα*), and

¹ Readers interested in this particle and its associates are referred to my *Hist. Greek Grammar*, §§ 1753 f., then Appendix vi. 12 f.; for *ὥς* §§ 1751 ff., 2086, then Appendix vi. 7, 12.

should be written *ὥσότι*, seeing that it is never disjoined into *ὥς* and *ὅτι* by the insertion of some other word between the two component parts, but always forms a single word, like *δι-ότι*, *καθ-ότι*, *ἐπει-δή*, *οὐκ-έτι*, *οὐ-πω*, *μέν-τοι*, *εἰ-τε*, *καί-περ*, *εὖ-γε*, *ὥσ-περ*, *οὐκ-οὖν*, *ὅτ-αν*, *ἐπειδ-άν*, etc. Be it as it may, *ὥσότι* made its appearance in the compositions of early Græco-Roman ages, and had a fairly wide run down to Byzantine times. Like declarative *ὅτι*, it depends upon a *verbum dicendi* or *sentientiendi* or some kindred term, and introduces a definite statement: *that*, often also an explanatory statement: *namely that*,—but never a reason, either objective (*because*)¹ or subjective (*as if*, *as though*). In view of these facts, Winer's opinion (*Grammar*, 771 f.), followed by other critics, that *ὥσότι* (*ὥς ὅτι*) has the meaning of German *als ob* (*as though*) and that it forms an ellipsis in which *ὥς* represents a whole subjective clause suppressed before the objective *ὅτι*-clause, though ingenious and prepossessing, is artificial and untenable; as a matter of fact, it does not suit the sense in the passages where it occurs.

The following typical instances may serve as illustrations of the real function and usage of the particle in question.²

Diod. Frg. ii. 536, 51 λέγων ὥσότι (*that*) Θρᾶκες ποτέ, κτλ. Dion. Hal. Ant. 9, 14 ἐπιγνοὺς ὥσότι (*that*) ἐν ἐσχάτοις εἰσὶν οἱ κατακλεισθέντες ἐν τοῖς λόφοις. Strabo 15, 57 τὸ ὑπὸ Τιμαγένους λεχθὲν, ὥσότι (*namely that*) χαλκὸς ὄοιτο. Jos. Apion. 1, 11 (1, 5 Niese) ἱκανῶς δὲ φανερόν, ὥς οἶμαι, πεποιηκὼς ὥσότι πατριὸς ἐστὶν ἢ περὶ τῶν παλαιῶν ἀναγραφῇ τοῖς βαρβάροις μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν, βούλομαι μικρὰ πρότερον διαλεχθῆναι. Anth. Pal. 9, 531 Ὁ οὐκ ἐθέλουσα Τύχη σε προήγαγεν, ἀλλ' ἵνα δείξῃ ὥσότι (*that*)

¹ The passage LXX. Esth. 4, 14 ὥς ὅτι ἐὰν παρακούσης, will be considered in my 4th article.

² Such instances as Xen. Hell. 3, 2, 14 εἰπὼν τῷ Φάρακι ὥσότι ὀκνοίη, and Isocr. Bousiris 520 κατηγοροῦν αὐτοῦ ὥσότι καὶνὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρει, are apparently chargeable to their Byzantine copiers.

πάντα ποιεῖν δύναται. Clem. Rom. Hom. 1, 7 ἵνα ἴδω εἰ ταῦθ' οὗτος λέγων ἀληθεύει, ὥσόντι (*namely that*) υἱὸς θεοῦ ἐπιδεδήμηκεν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ. Orig. i. 752c τὸ μέγιστον περὶ τῆς συστάσεως τοῦ Ἰησοῦ κεφάλαιον, ὥσόντι (*namely that*) προεφητεύθη ὑπὸ τῶν παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις προφητῶν. Athan. i. 312A οὐκ ἡγνούμεν ἀλλὰ καὶ φανερόν ἡμῖν ἦν ὥσόντι (*that*) οἱ τῆς δυσωνύμου τῶν Ἀρειανῶν προστάται πολλὰ καὶ δεινὰ ἐμχανῶντο. Schol. in Ar. Pac. 507 ἀναφέρων ὥσόντι . . . ἐθαλασσοκράτουν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι. Schol. in Aeschin. et Isocr. (ed. G. Dindorf) p. 6, 14 φασὶ γὰρ ὥσόντι (*that*) οὐδὲν τοῦ χαρακτήρος τοῦ Πλάτωνος σφῆζει. So too 24, 10. Then 59, 32 θέλομεν εἰπεῖν ὥσόντι, κτλ. 67, 8 ἔχει τις εἰπεῖν ὥσόντι αὐτὸς μόνος ὁ Φάλαικος ἡγνόμεν τὴν Φιλίππου γνώμην. 83, 30 εἶπεν ὥσόντι οἱ δῆμοι, κτλ. So further 92, 30. 93, 11. 105, 1. 105, 3 εἵπομεν ὥσόντι ζηλωτῆς ἐγένετο τοῦ Γοργίου,—and so on passim. Schol. Il. B 78 φάσκων ὥσόντι πολλαὶ πόλεις ὁμοφωνοῦσι προσηγορικοῖς. Γ 280. I 6 προσθεῖναι ἐκείνο ὥσόντι (*namely that*), κτλ. Cyrill. Scyth. V. S. 311c λέγειν ὥσόντι, κτλ. Vita Epiph. 104A ἔγραψεν ὥσόντι Ἰωάννης τὰ Ωριγένους φρονεῖ. Leont. Neap. V. S. 1677A προβαλλόμενος μάρτυρα ὥσόντι οὐδὲν, κτλ. Chron. Pasch. 731, 13 ἐδεξάμεθα ἀπόκρισιν ὥσόντι μέγαν χειμῶνα εὐρον.¹

So also then in the New Testament compositions, where it occurs thrice. The first passage is 2 Corinthians 5, 19 τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ διὰ (Rec. Ἰησοῦ) Χριστοῦ καὶ δόντος ἡμῖν τὴν διακονίαν τῆς καταλλαγῆς, ὥσόντι Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ. Here ὥσόντι is correctly rendered “to wit that” by both the A. and R. versions, despite the contrary comments of modern critics.

On the other hand, in 2 Corinthians 11, 20, 21 ἀνέχεσθε γὰρ εἴ τις ὑμᾶς καταδουλοῖ, εἴ τις κατεσθίει, εἴ τις λαμβάνει, εἴ τις ἐπαίρεται [ἐπαρᾶται?], εἴ τις εἰς πρόσωπον ὑμᾶς δέρει

¹ For more particulars see my *Hist. Greek Grammar* §§ 1753 ff.

κατὰ ἀτιμίαν. λέγω ὥσότι ἡμεῖς ἡσθενήκαμεν,—not only ὥσότι, but other parts of the passage are misunderstood. I mean that the adverbial expression κατὰ ἀτιμίαν does not refer to Paul, but to the Jews (τις); hence it belongs not to λέγω, but to the preceding δέρει. The whole passage therefore should, in my opinion, be rendered thus:

“For ye bear with one if one reduceth you to bondage, if one ruineth you, if one layeth hold of you, if one exalteth oneself [accurseth you?], if one smiteth you on the face to your disgrace. I say (*that*) I have been weak.”

Similarly in the rather obscure passage, 2 Thessalonians 2, 1 f. ὥσότι ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου, the current rendering of ὥσότι by “as that,” if this means anything (=as though?), should make room for “*namely that* the day of the Lord is present.”

5. ΠΩΣ (=declarative ὅτι), *that*.

Regarding πῶς, as an equivalent of declarative ὅτι, *that* it made its appearance in, or rather found its way into, the literary compositions of the Græco-Roman period, and soon met with increasing popularity which it maintained ever since. As a matter of fact, this particle—formerly an adverb of manner exclusively and now a declarative *conjunction* as well—in its latter function eventually (*i.e.* since the Middle Ages) has practically ousted ὅτι from ordinary speech, so that in the vernacular Greek of to-day πῶς is by far commoner than ὅτι. Now that this πῶς, when it acts as a declarative conjunction (*that*), bears no stress is manifest from the nature of its function. Its relation to the interrogative adverb πῶς is somewhat like that of English declarative *that* (in: I mean ‘that’ man is mortal) to demonstrative *that* (in: I mean *that* man). Hence declarative πῶς bears no stress and had perhaps be better written πῶς if not even πως.

And now let us come to actual illustrations, first from

secular and extra-canonical texts, then from the New Testament compositions.

Pap. Berol. 6884 (= Griechische Urkunden zu Berlin no. 37; dated 51 A.D.) οἶδας πῶς αὐτοῦ (i.e. τοῦ Στοτόητος) ἐκάστης ὥρας χρῆζω, "ye know *that* (not 'how') I need him every moment." Epict. Diss. 1, 18, 1 γνώσῃ πῶς ἀπάνθρωπόν ἐστιν ὃ λέγεις καὶ ὅτι ἐκείνῳ ὅμοιον, "*that* it is cruel and like him." 2, 1, 17 ἰδοὺ πῶς οὐ δάκνει, "ye see *that* he does not bite (surely not 'how he does not bite'!)." So too *ib.* 34 and 35; then 2, 19, 15 δείκνυε πῶς εἴωθας ἐν πλοίῳ χεიმάζεσθαι, "show *that* you are accosted." Clem. R. ad Cor. 19, 3 νοήσωμεν πῶς ἀόργητος ὑπάρχει πρὸς πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν αὐτοῦ. 21, 3 ἴδωμεν πῶς ἐγγύς ἐστιν καὶ ὅτι οὐδὲν λέληθεν αὐτόν. 34, 5 κατανοήσωμεν τὸ πᾶν πλήθος τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ πῶς τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ λειτουργοῦσι παρεστῶτες. So too 37, 2; 56, 16. Ignat. ad Smyrn. 6, 2 καταμάθετε τοὺς ἑτεροδοξοῦντας πῶς ἐναντίοι εἰσὶ τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ θεοῦ. Barn. 14, 6 γέγραπται γὰρ πῶς αὐτῷ ὁ πατήρ ἐντέλλεται. 16, 1 ἐρῶ ὑμῖν πῶς ἤλπισαν. Acta Xanthip. 59, 11 ὁρᾷς, ἀδελφέ, τὰ ξόανα τῶν δαιμόνων ταραττόμενα, πῶς οὐ φέρουσι τοῦ λόγου τὴν δύναμιν; 80, 34 ἰδὼν πῶς ἡ ἑρίμνα αὐτοῦ πᾶσα ἦν εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς. 82, 27 νῦν ἔγνω ἀκριβῶς πῶς φθονεῖ ὁ διάβολος τῇ παρθενίᾳ. 85, 23 ὁρᾷς πῶς διὰ πολλῶν προφάσεων σφίζει ὁ θεός. Acta Pilati ii. 1, 2 γογγύζουσι κατ' αὐτοῦ πῶς τοσαύτης τιμῆς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἤξιωσεν. *ib.* ἰδὼν Ἰούδας πῶς ἤγαγον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐνώπιον Πιλάτου. 16, 3 ὁ οὖν Ἰωσήφ ὡμολόγει ὅτι ἐκῆδευσε καὶ ἔθαψεν αὐτὸν μετὰ τοῦ Νικοδήμου καὶ πῶς ἐστιν ἀληθὲς ὅτι ἠγέρθη. Narratio Iosephi 3, 3 θεωρῶ πῶς ὁ διάβολος χαίρων τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λαμβάνει. Apophthegm. Patrum 249B οὐ βλέπεις τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς πῶς εἰσιν ὡς ἄγγελοι εἰς τὴν σύναξιν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ; Dorothei. 1629A λέγω πῶς αἱ ἐντολαὶ πᾶσι τοῖς χριστιανοῖς ἐδόθησαν. 1832B λέγω ὑμῖν πῶς ἡ ψυχὴ τριμερὴς ἐστιν. Leont. Neap. Vita Joh. 5, 21 εἰπόντος πρὸς αὐτὸν πῶς Διὰ τὴν ἀγάπην ὠφέλησόν με. Io. Moschos 2992C

ἀρέσκει σοι πῶς ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτὴ ὑπὸ τοῦ δαίμονος ἀδικεῖται καὶ ἀσχημονεῖ,—and so on down to present speech.

That this declarative or recitative πῶς (= ὅτι) occurs in the New Testament compositions is a fact evidenced by many instances, *e.g.* Matt. 12, 4 (also Luke 6, 4). Mark 9, 12. 12, 26 and 41. Luke 8, 36. Acts 11, 13. 20, 18. Rev. 3, 3. As a matter of course in all these cases πῶς is mistaken for the familiar adverb πῶς, *how*, either interrogative or exclamatory. But a close inspection of the respective passages, coupled with the occasional alternative reading ὡς (= ὅτι, as: Mark 12, 26. Luke 6, 4), and the parallel usage in secular and extra-canonical texts decide the question beyond doubt. Thus Matt. 12, 14 οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησε Δαβὶδ ὅτε ἐπέινασε καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ; πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγεν κτλ., “*that* he entered,” not “*how* he entered,” since Jesus refers to the *fact* not to the manner in which David entered and ate the shewbread. So too Luke 6, 4, unless we read with the best MSS. ὡς εἰσῆλθεν, “*that* (not ‘*how*’ or when’) he entered.”

Mark 9, 12 ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς· Ἠλίας μὲν ἐλθὼν πρῶτον ἀποκαθιστᾷ πάντα καὶ πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κτλ.¹

“And he said unto them, Indeed when Elijah has first come, he restoreth all things; and *that* it is written of the Son of man,” etc.

Mark 12, 26 περὶ δὲ τῶν νεκρῶν ὅτι ἐγείρονται (= περὶ δὲ τῆς ἐγέρσεως τῶν νεκρῶν) οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ Μωσέως ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου πῶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεός, “*that* God spake unto him” (not ‘*how*’).

Mark 12, 41 καὶ καθίσας κατέναντι τοῦ γαζοφυλακίου ἐθεώρει πῶς ὁ ὄχλος βάλλει χαλκὸν εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον,

¹ Compare John 3, 28 αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς μοι μαρτυρεῖτε ὅτι εἶπον· “Οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστός,” ἀλλ’ ὅτι “Ἀπεσταλμένος εἰμὶ ἔμπροσθεν ἐκείνου.”

“*that* (*i.e.* the fact that, not the manner in which) people was casting coppers into the treasury.”

Acts 11, 13 ἀπήγγειλε δὲ ἡμῖν πῶς εἶδεν τὸν ἄγγελον, *i.e.* (the fact) “that he had seen the angel” (not how he had seen).

Acts 12, 17 διηγῆσατο αὐτοῖς πῶς ὁ κύριος αὐτὸν ἐξήγαγεν ἐκ τῆς φυλακῆς, “declared unto them *that* the Lord had brought him out of the prison” (not how, *i.e.* not the manner, since this would imply a previous knowledge of the fact).

Acts 20, 18 ἐπίστασθε . . . πῶς μεθ’ ὑμῶν τὸν πάντα χρόνον ἐγενόμην, “ye know *that* (not ‘after what manner’) I spent all that time with you.”

Rev. 3, 3 μνημόνευε πῶς εἴληφας καὶ ἤκουσας, *i.e.* “remember *that* (not ‘how’) thou hast received and heard.”

A. N. JANNARIS.

*THE PLACE OF WRITING AND DESTINATION
OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.*

To the June number of the *EXPOSITOR* Prof. Ramsay contributed an article on "The Date and Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews," which, it need hardly be said, was fresh and suggestive in the highest degree, like everything that proceeds from his pen. The main conclusions to which the paper pointed were (1) That the Epistle to the Hebrews was the Epistle of the Church at Cæsarea, and was finished during the time of St. Paul's imprisonment there in the spring of A.D. 59; (2) That it embodied the result of the Apostle's discussions with the brethren at Cæsarea, and that St. Paul himself added the closing verses with his own hand; and (3) That it was addressed to the Jewish party of the Church at Jerusalem. No one will deny that, if these propositions can be established with any degree of certainty, we have not only got a highly interesting theory regarding the Epistle's origin, but one which throws light upon many of its most interesting features. And it is indeed largely on the ground of its generally "illuminative" character, rather than upon any direct evidence in support of it, that Prof. Ramsay asks acceptance for his theory. Thus, as he points out, upon this view we have got the gap between the earlier Pauline Epistles and the Epistles of the Roman captivity bridged over by a letter in which St. Paul had an active interest: we have a natural explanation of the wide-spread belief in the early Church that the Epistle, though differing in style and language from St. Paul's admitted Epistles, still owed something to him: and we are enabled, further, to connect the Epistle with what undoubtedly at first sight seems its natural destination, Jerusalem.

A theory combining these advantages is certainly deserv-

ing of the most careful consideration ; and it may well seem presumptuous on the part of the present writer even to attempt to criticise it. At the same time it appears to him that there are certain difficulties connected with the theory, as at present set forth by Prof. Ramsay, that cannot easily be set aside. And it is in the hope of inducing Prof. Ramsay to restate his views in greater detail, and so possibly to dispose of some of these difficulties, that he ventures to draw attention to one or two points.

1. Prof. Ramsay is apparently led to connect the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the first instance, with Cæsarea by the parallelism which, following the Rev. W. M. Lewis, he finds between the topics it discusses, and the thoughts which were present in St. Paul's mind at Cæsarea, as proved, for example, by his address to Agrippa. We cannot reproduce the examples of this connexion here ; but admitting that they afford as striking a parallelism as Prof. Ramsay thinks they do, how can we reconcile them with the still greater differences between our Epistle and the general Pauline teaching? Mr. Lewis has no difficulty here, for for him these differences do not exist, and he regards the whole Epistle as the reproduction of the Apostle's thoughts in the words of an amanuensis or editor, whom he holds to have been St. Luke. But if this is to attribute, as Prof. Ramsay justly states that it is, too little independent action to the writer, are we not landed in the somewhat anomalous position that the same Epistle which this theory sets out by regarding as embodying "the general impression and outcome" of the discussions which St. Paul held with the leading men of the Church at Cæsarea shows at the same time by its entirely different use of such common Pauline terms as "Faith" and "the Law," that it is moving in a circle of ideas "not contradictory, but complementary to, and yet absolutely different in nature from, Paul's ideas"? (The EXPOSITOR, June, 1899, p. 420).

We do not say that such a combination is impossible, and "an independent thinking out" by the writer of certain ideas he had derived from St. Paul may go far to explain it; but it seems to us that just in so far as Prof. Ramsay, here separating himself from Mr. Lewis, insists, and rightly insists, upon the marked divergence in the Epistle from general Pauline teaching, he weakens the link by which at the same time he seeks to connect it with Cæsarea.

It may be added that the ideas which Mr. Lewis claims, and Prof. Ramsay approves, as characteristic of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the *later* Pauline Epistles, and which are brought forward to show that St. Paul was thinking at Cæsarea about the same topics that the Epistle discusses, are hardly able to bear the strain put upon them. Thus the headship of Christ over the Church, though undoubtedly most fully developed in the later Pauline Epistles, is by no means confined to them; nor, again, can it well be separated from that mystical union of Christ with the believer which is conspicuously absent from the Epistle to the Hebrews: the use of *ἄφεσις*, "forgiveness of sins," is, as Prof. Ramsay himself admits, not confined to *Ephesians* and *Colossians*, but is used by St. Paul also in *Acts* xiii. 38, and thrice by St. Peter (*Acts* ii. 38; v. 31; x. 43); and the context of *Colossians* i. 12 finds an analogy not only, as Bishop Lightfoot has pointed out, in *Acts* xxvi. 18, but, according to the same writer, also in an earlier speech of St. Paul's (*Acts* xx. 32).

2. Further objection to Prof. Ramsay's view may, however, be raised not only on such general grounds as we have been stating, but on the interpretation given to certain expressions in the closing verses of the Epistle, which he holds to have been added directly by St. Paul himself.¹

¹ In this Prof. Ramsay claims to be following Delitzsch, but we have been unable to find any passage in the latter's Commentary to this effect. On

Thus we are told that it is "not at all improbable that at some time during his long imprisonment Paul expected that the trial would not be longer delayed, and that he would shortly be in Jerusalem" (*ut supra*, p. 418), and that it is to this expectation that he refers when he asks the prayers of the Hebrews, "that I may be restored to you the sooner" (xiii. 19). But to whatever obstacle these words may refer as interposing at the moment between the writer and those whom he is addressing, it can hardly be to imprisonment, in view of the confident declaration of v. 23: "Know ye that our brother Timothy hath been set at liberty; ¹ with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you." These words are surely the words of a man who not merely "regards it as practically fixed that he is shortly to be in the place where the persons addressed are," but who has, so far at least, freedom of action in bringing this about.²

Nor does the mention of Timothy add weight to the argument that this verse was actually written by St. Paul himself, but, strictly interpreted, points rather the other way. For it is an "interesting little point of expression," whose full significance Prof. Ramsay can estimate so well, that the order of the words in the Greek is τὸν ἀδελφὸν

the contrary, Delitzsch distinctly rebuts Ebrard's idea that St. Luke added xiii. 22-25 in his own name on the ground that this passage "has not the nature of a postscript" (*Comm.*, E. Tr. ii. p. 416). According to Riehm (*Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefes*, p. 26 note), both Thiersch and Lutterbeck ascribed xiii. 17-25 directly to St. Paul, but he does not state on what grounds. Their view is shared, so far as we can discover, by none of the more recent commentators.

¹ Prof. Ramsay prefers the rendering "has been sent away on a mission" for ἀπολελυμένον (comp. "whom we have sent from us," Tindale, 1526). If so, may it refer, not, as Prof. Ramsay thinks, to a mission in which Timothy was engaged during St. Paul's imprisonment in Cæsarea, but to his work in Asia between the Apostle's first and second Roman imprisonments (comp. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 350)? An additional link to those to be mentioned afterwards is thus established between our Epistle and Rome; for, if Timothy were already known there, the Church would be glad to hear of his proposed return.

² It was the difficulty of reconciling vv. 19 and 23, and the idea that in order to do so they required different subjects, that led Ebrard to the conjecture mentioned in a previous note (see his *Comm. on Hebrews*, E. Tr., p. 377).

ἡμῶν Τιμόθεον, whereas the order St. Paul invariably adopts is Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφός (2 Cor. i. 1; Col. i. 1; 1 Thess. iii. 2; Philem. 1; and comp. Rom. xvi. 23; 1 Cor. xvi. 12; 2 Cor. ii. 13; Phil. ii. 25; Col. iv. 7; and Westcott *in loc.*).

3. There remains still the question of destination, and it is here, we imagine, that Prof. Ramsay's theory will be most eagerly welcomed, for, while it gives expression to the widespread desire to associate on general grounds the Epistle with Jerusalem, it does away with certain of the objections usually urged against that view by substituting the thought of a Jewish part or section of the Church for the Church at large.

Thus we can at least imagine such a section to have been made up of members, none of whom had seen or heard the Lord Himself in accordance with c. ii. 3, and to have furnished no actual martyrs to Christ's cause in accordance with c. xii. 4, statements which can hardly be said to apply to the original Church at Jerusalem. And we can also get over the difficulty of a daughter Church; or, if we are to associate the Epistle with an individual, an Evangelist like Philip the Deacon, venturing to use such terms as c. v. 12, "For when by reason of the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need again that some one teach you the rudiments of the first principles of the oracles of God," if the reference is not to the Mother Church, from which already teachers had been "scattered abroad . . . preaching the word" (Acts viii. 4), but to a backward party in it.

At the same time we confess that we find ourselves unable to follow Prof. Ramsay in the argument by which he seeks to connect the Epistle to the Hebrews with Jerusalem, owing to the divergence of views which he finds existing there between the leaders of the Church and the great mass of the congregation, and of which he thinks there is no evidence that it existed anywhere else. For, granting that this divergence did exist at Jerusalem, what evidence have

we that the thought of it was present to the writer of our Epistle? Hardly c. xiii. 24: "Salute all them that have the rule over you, and all the saints," upon which Prof. Ramsay lays such stress. The words certainly imply that a separate body of "leaders" existed, and that the Hebrews were addressed apart from them. But surely no one reading the words dispassionately is led by them to think of an actual difference of opinion as existing between these two bodies, in the absence of other and more specific traces of this in the Epistle. The emphatic repetition of "all . . . all" seems rather to imply that the writer is thinking simply of the existence of *various* leaders and *various* communities to all of whom he desires to send greeting.

If this be admitted, the verse may then be taken as supplying an additional argument that the Epistle was addressed not to Jerusalem, but to Rome, the destination which is at present so widely advocated, especially by German scholars. For the unusual mode of address in *Romans* i. 7, "To all that are in Rome" (instead of "To the Church which is at Rome," comp. 1 *Cor.* i. 2; *Gal.* i. 2), and the tendency of the greetings in *Romans* xvi. to fall into groups, both go to prove that the "Church of Rome at this time consisted of a number of such little groups, scattered over the great city, each with its own rendezvous but without any complete and centralized organization." ¹

We are very far indeed from saying that the Roman address is conclusively established on this or the other grounds which are usually brought forward in its favour. But if we think, as we have tried to show elsewhere that we can,² not of the great Roman Church with its large admixture of Gentile converts, but of a smaller body of

¹ See Sanday and Headlam, *Comm. on Romans*, p. xxxv. ; and comp. Gore, *The Epistle to the Romans*, cc. i.-viii., p. 49.

² *The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (T. and T. Clarke, 1899), p. 49. For Professor Ramsay's kindly references to this book we need hardly say that we are very grateful.

believers, who owed their conversion to imperfectly-instructed teachers, and who had continued to maintain a markedly Jewish type of Christianity,¹ we seem at least brought face to face with a body of readers who were in need of the particular teaching this Epistle supplies. For the more closely the Epistle is studied as a whole, the more clearly, we venture to think, will it be seen that the writer's main purpose is not, as is so often stated, to prevent a threatened apostasy to Judaism, to which from their circumstances the Jerusalem Christians were peculiarly liable, but so to set forth the true meaning and glory of Christianity as to urge those who from their special circumstances were still "babes" in knowledge to a new and higher stage of progress.

Upon this, however, we cannot at present dwell. The purpose of this paper, as we have already stated, is simply to indicate one or two grounds on which Mr. Lewis and Prof. Ramsay's interesting theory seems to us unsatisfactory, more particularly in view of the absence of any direct external evidence in support of it.²

GEORGE MILLIGAN.

¹ We may perhaps be allowed to strengthen this view here from two independent quarters:—(1) Prof. Hort, in his *Prolegomena to the Romans*, after speaking of the firm footing Pauline Christianity had apparently established in Rome previous to the writing of the Epistle, adds, "it is probable, rather on general grounds than on definite historical evidence, that Jewish types of Christianity, one or more, had likewise their representatives" (p. 18). (2) In *The Expository Times*, x. p. 422, Prof. Nestle adverts to the same possible connexion between our Epistle and the συναγωγή Αἰβρέων at Rome, which, following a hint of Bishop Westcott's, we suggested in the book already referred to (*Theol. of the Ep. to the Hebrews*, p. 50).

² It may be noted that Ewald had already thought on different grounds of Cæsarea as the place of writing of the Epistle; see his *Das Sendschreiben a. d. Hebräer*, p. 8.

FATHER JOHN IN RELATION TO THE RUSSIAN CHURCH.

THE Russian Church—the Church of St. Andrew and of Vladimir, of Nestor the historian and Philaret, Patriarch of Moscow and father of the founder of the present reigning house, of Nikon the Reformer and of Father John of Kronstadt—has received little or no attention in the widespread interest in Russian affairs generally that is manifest in our country at this time. And this is hardly as it should be; for not only as a part—and by far the greatest and the most important part—of the Eastern or Greek Orthodox Church does she share a venerable and inspiring history with the other members of that confederation prior to her own peculiar and romantic story, but in Russia more than in any other European country is the Church national. From the very earliest times the religious and the national elements have been closely identified in the Russian State. “Its religious festivals are still national; its national festivals are still religious,” to use Dean Stanley’s epigram; and he who would rightly understand the one, must know something of the other.

We are not here concerned with the history of that Church; what will rather be attempted is to give some account of the Russian Church of to-day, to paint as it were a background against which the subject of these notes may stand out in clear relief.

The activity of the Russian Church manifests itself in three distinct directions—in ordinary parish work (the labours of the White Clergy), in the monasteries (with

which are associated the Black Clergy), and in definite missionary enterprise.

The missions of any particular Church are generally taken as a fair index of the spiritual life of that community. When compared with the Western Churches from this point of view, those of the East suffer badly. "In regard to missions," says the brilliant historian of Oriental Christianity already quoted, "the inaction of the Eastern Churches is well known. While the Latin Church has sent out missionaries for the conversion of England and Germany in the middle ages, of South America, of India, and of China down to our own time; whilst many Protestants pour the whole of their religious energy exclusively into missionary enterprise, the Eastern Churches, as a rule, have remained content with the maintenance of their own faith. The preaching of Ulfilas to the Goths, of the Nestorian missions in Asia, and, in modern times, of Russia in Siberia and the Aleutian Islands are but striking exceptions." And then he goes on to say, as if in palliation, that if the Eastern Churches are not missionary they do not at least persecute. No one would, I think, venture to make these assertions about the Russian Church of to-day. In the first place a good case could assuredly be made in defence of the thesis that the Russian Church is a persecuting Church. In the second place, every one who considers the compact nature of the Russian Empire and of the many heathen peoples that own allegiance to the great White Tsar will see that theoretically all Russian missionary work must, in the broadest sense, be of the nature of a home mission for a long time to come: Russia has no colonies. And so in Siberia alone there are missions in the Altai region, amongst the nomadic Kirgiz, amongst the sub-arctic Tchuktchi, in Kamtchatka, in Irkutsk, and in Transbaikalia amongst the Buriats. In European Russia there is a mission in the neighbourhood of

Astrakhan, and also near Kazan amongst the Tartars. In Caucasasia, moreover, considerable missionary activity has been shown; whilst in other countries, *e.g.* at Jerusalem, Pekin, and notably in Japan, the emissaries of the Russian Church have met with distinct success. Finally, the entire bishopric of Aleutia in North-west America constitutes an extensive sphere of Russian influence in the New World. No one pretends that the work accomplished by the Russian preachers of the Cross is missionary in our sense of the expression, unless perhaps in Japan. The mere fact that it is seriously related of the great Innocent that he converted 300,000 Yakutes, and of Theophilact in Caucasasia that he won more than 40,000 souls to the faith, shows in how great measure the work must have been superficial. Still all of it was not so, and the foregoing data afford at least some answer to the reproach of spiritual inertness so often cast at the Russian Church.

The Black Clergy and the monasteries associated with them need not detain us when considering the Russian Church in connection with Father John. In Russia there are nearly 700 monasteries and nunneries with a population of 15,000, excluding lay brethren and sisters. Upon the monks celibacy is imposed as a rule of the Church, and from their number are chosen the men who fill the highest ecclesiastical positions. As a class they are said to look down upon the parish priests or White Clergy, who really do all the spiritual work, and who, as the body to which Father John belongs, merit some fuller discussion.

It is a sufficiently difficult task to find in any language a sympathetic treatment of the Russian priest. For his unpopularity there are many reasons. The ministry is to him a profession, not a vocation. During a certain period in their history the White Clergy formed an exclusive caste; and the peculiar unconscious hostility that

at once arises against any exclusive body remained even after the primary occasion of that unpopularity had been removed. To the average Russian religion is still a round of rite and ceremonial. The priest is commonly a man without an ideal, one with whom the public mind does not associate nor indeed from whom does it expect any of those qualities which we *demand* in those who are called to work in this lofty sphere. Popular opinion about the priests is crystallized in many witty and sometimes coarse sayings, for which unfortunately there is ample justification. One of Pushkin's verses—a suggested epitaph—runs thus :

In this cemetery there is a grave,
In this grave there is a bier,
In this bier there is a priest,
And in this priest there is some brandy.

Open one of the best books on modern Russia—"Au Pays Russe," by Legras—and take at random any one of his sketches of village priests. They are true to life, and the effect is not pleasing. "At dinner the priest of N—— was our guest. Blind of an eye, dirty, with fair curly hair and unkempt beard, with the air of a jolly fellow, especially when the vodka which precedes the hors d'œuvres has loosened his tongue. He is placed at my side, and I am inconvenienced by the odour which comes from his yellow cassock, turned at places to reddish brown, frayed and torn here and there. He eats with avidity, without ceasing to smile and jabber. He has an evil tongue, and tells stories about his colleagues which tend to prove that they are all thieves and drunkards. After the siesta, we sit down to play at cards ; it is for this above all that the priest has come. At supper, towards ten o'clock, several glasses of vodka have finished him, as also a poor young wretch of a teacher who was there with him. Both are drunk, but the priest

comports himself quite well, whilst the schoolmaster talks nonsense. Nevertheless they continue to play till two in the morning. Then they are put into the carriage, the one propped up against the other, and in the black night Ivan drives them home."

The average Russian priest is thus a creature with little to commend him in the eyes of his parishioners, who are only too ready to make him a butt for their rude ridicule. As Legras says in another place, "I know no country where the people speak such evil about their priests—and the monks also for that matter—as in Holy Russia."

It is admitted on all hands that even now the means of support of the parish clergy are preposterously insufficient. They are practically placed in dependence upon the parochial community; in consequence they are sadly tempted to direct their energies in the first instance to getting out of the peasants as much as they can in return for their performance of church rites both public and private. Income from any other source is so small and so precarious that it may quite well be left out of account. "For the first time, in the forties, the parish clergy were allowed from the Treasury a sum of £10,000 a year, but subsequently this aid was discontinued, and has only been renewed since 1893." Even in that year, with a vastly increased grant of State aid, only half of the parishes received support from the Treasury, and that merely to the average extent of £34 per parish. In the towns at the first glance the conditions appear even worse in this respect, for there the priests have no fixed income at all. To each Church, in a town or city, a definite number of priests is attached, who divide the income amongst themselves. The people do not as a rule worship regularly at any one place, preferring to wander. The priests carry on no serious visitation amongst them;

they enter the people's houses only on the great holidays, and receive a little money for the recital of prayers. Extempore prayer is not allowed; the set forms in the Liturgy must alone be used even on such private occasions. Many priests openly maintain that the State interest in the Church is merely pecuniary. Educational and charitable institutions are supported out of the money—a large sum—obtained, *e.g.*, by the sale of candles. The clergy have no place in society owing to their comparative lack of education. It is only when contrasted with such men, and when viewed against this disheartening background, that one fully realizes the unique character of the life and work of Father John. Still it would not be right to pass to more particular consideration of that remarkable man before briefly adverting to the brighter side of the question which we have been considering. One hopeful feature is the way in which the people attend the churches. They are waiting and ready to hear. In the Russian constitution there is a certain ingrained religiosity that will enforce attention to, and a deeply emotional nature that will respond to, a heart-stirring, commanding call to repentance and to righteousness; but since the days of St. Vladimir that appeal has never been made, unless it be now in our time and generation by the mouth of Father John. But, further, there are amongst the rank and file of the clergy many exceptions to the type of man portrayed above; men who endure the hardness of their lot and do seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, content to trust that a sufficient measure of the other things will be added unto them. And as a matter of fact they are; for the peasants are not slow to recognise a disinterested, unselfish life. Again, more care is being expended upon the education of the clergy, and they even now begin to recover, although very slowly, the place in society which has so

long been denied them. It is just possible that Father John, so solitary to-day, may even yet, before his course is run, see the beginning of an awakening in Russia in the only sphere where her ancient torpidity is not as yet thrown off, viz., that of true religion.

* * * * *

The tourist who approaches St. Petersburg from the sea is, towards the end of his voyage, borne past an island—Kotlin—on which is situated Kronstadt, the port and outer defence of the capital. The population of the town numbers some 60,000, of which nearly one-half is garrison. Here fortifications were first raised by Peter the Great against the Swedes in 1703, and during subsequent reigns they were strengthened and enlarged; but the present formidable lines—impregnable, from the Russian point of view—date in their completeness from after 1854, in which year, at the time of the Crimean War, two vessels of the British Baltic Squadron sent out to reconnoitre ascended the northern channel farther than the Russians cared to see, demonstrating that if there had been necessity they could have made a dash for the capital. A sunken dam supporting seven batteries now guards this particular passage; three lines of forts constitute the outer defences, while masked and open batteries, redoubts and earthworks are simply strewn about the island.

Kronstadt is the chief station of the Russian Baltic fleet, but there are also at least two harbours for merchant vessels, and from May to November the wharves and dock-yards swarm with busy men. During this period wages are high for Russia; the stevedores make from eighteen-pence to half a crown a day; but in winter the port is still with a northern stillness. In itself Kronstadt presents little of interest. The streets are long and broad with the length and breadth of Russian thoroughfares; continually they

resound to the measured tramp of soldiers going from one position to another. Apart from war considerations, however, Kronstadt is a poor place in every sense of the term, so much so that after exhausting the interests of the little seven-mile island in a forenoon, the officer who kindly acted as guide finally conducted me to the military cemetery as worthy of a visit. And in this he was right, for the serried rows of mounds, at the head of each of which stands a little metal cross inscribed with the name and rank of the man who lies at its foot, the unhewn monolith bearing the expressive words, "Comrades to a Comrade," above the nameless grave of the young officer who sought escape in death from the cruel net of his own weaving—all these form a necessary part of the background of the picture which we are studying. And it is now that one saw how strange it was that in Kronstadt, this centre of naval and of military activity, should be found the most renowned Russian ambassador of the Prince of Peace.

"I am the son of a sacristan of the province of Archangel, from the village of Sursk, and I was born in the year 1829." (He is thus a year younger than Count Leo Tolstoi.) "Now, although I had not been prepared for school, hardly knowing how to spell, I entered the Archangel Parish School as a paying scholar in my tenth year. There they gave me letters; careful individual instruction there was none; I was obliged to face all my difficulties alone. I suffered not a little vexation because of the seeming dulness of my comprehension. From my earliest years, my parents instructed me in prayer, and by their own personal example made me a religiously inclined boy. I loved prayer, divine service, and, in particular, good singing. Being so much put out by my slow progress in learning, I prayed passionately to God that He would give me more mind, and I remember how all at once there was a marvellous clearing up of my intellect—a veil, as it were, fell off

my mind—and I began to understand my lessons well. The older I grew the better I succeeded with my studies, so that almost from the bottom I rose to be dux of the scholars, especially in the seminary, out of which I passed first in 1851, and was sent to the Theological Academy of St. Petersburg to be educated for the Church at the cost of the State. The post of clerk to the Academy Board of Direction was at that time given to a student, with the modest salary of one pound a month. Having a mother, a poor widow, who needed my assistance, on the proposal of the secretary of the Board I agreed with joy to take the position. Having finished my Divinity course in 1855, I went as priest to Kronstadt, in December of that year, and married the daughter of the senior priest of the place, Elizabeth by name. Of children we have none, nor ever had any. In the very first days of my ministry I made it a rule to attend with the utmost possible earnestness to my work as pastor and priest, and strictly examined myself as to my inner life. With this intent in particular I took to the closest study of the Holy Scriptures, selecting from them what most concerned myself as a man, as a minister, and as a member of society. Then I began to keep a diary, in which I set down my inward struggles with myself, my expressions of repentance, my secret prayers to God, and my gratitude for deliverance from temptations, afflictions, and misfortunes; and every Sunday and feast day I speak and preach in church, either delivering my own sermons or those of the Metropolitan Gregory. Besides my preaching, from the very beginning of my ministry I tried to take the utmost care of the poor, the more so that I was one of them myself. Nearly thirty-one years ago I conceived the idea of founding in Kronstadt a Workhouse and Refuge for poor people, which God helped me to do ten years later."

This large institution is mainly supported by donations received by Father John from those to whom he has been

of service, and it is now managed by a committee. It consists of several departments. There is, first, accommodation for those who wish to have special interviews with Father John—either in the form of a common lodging-room, with perhaps thirty beds at eightpence the night, or more select separate apartments at two shillings. There is also the night shelter for the poor, with dinner for a halfpenny, and a wooden bed, pillow, and coverlet for a fraction more. There is also a school for orphan boys and girls. In another wing of the institution—for it comprises several self-contained houses, and embraces sixteen different philanthropic agencies—is the home for aged and infirm men and women. At all seasons of the year the cheap dinner of soup with meat and bread is well patronised. In summer the men come to and return from it to their work in the dockyards, but it is in winter, when there is little to be done, that they fully appreciate the advantages of the work-house.

To the institute is also attached a church with its private entrance from the street to the altar, a necessary precaution. Here every morning at 5 a.m. Father John conducts a service. There is another large room where he receives people who have come specially to see him. Off the church opens a private chamber, along one wall of which runs an extensive wardrobe where are hung one upon the other a most magnificent collection of priestly garments of immense value, gifted to Father John by different admirers from the late Emperor downwards. These he never wears. Along the opposite walls are fitted great glass-doored cupboards containing other rare and costly presents, goblets of gold and silver, enormous Bibles with solid, silver-gilt cases, some inlaid with the beautiful Moscow enamel work, or embossed with mother-of-pearl, on which, in one instance, are tastefully painted representations of the four Evangelists.

In great contrast to all this is his own humble dwelling. It stands at the corner of two unimportant streets, and is entered from a courtyard surrounded in part by the usual high boarded-up fence. It consists of two or three rooms scantily furnished, but he cannot be said to spend much of his time there. His life is one long act of beneficence. From the early morning, when he leaves his home in a drojky—he would never arrive if he went on foot—his every movement is dogged by crowds of people demonstratively anxious to obtain his blessing or even see him as he passes. Pilgrims and beggars cry for aid from a man whom they verily believe to be divine; those that sit in high places are no less solicitous in their demands upon his time and prayers. And so, up and down Kronstadt, in the capital, to Moscow, and yet more distant parts of this world-empire, does the great priest continually move in his practice of the life of Christ. The people say that he never sleeps; but he is naturally a strong man. They say that he seldom eats or drinks; it may be that his meals are very irregular; still into whatever house he enters, he generally partakes of some food and drink. But behind all the accretion of popular fancy there remains a personality which the most critically-minded man cannot but *feel* whenever he is brought into contact with it. Measured by ordinary standards of greatness, there is nothing in Father John that would make it worth a man's while to cross the street to see him. It is nothing that he *does* that attracts, it is what he *is*. It is the life in some ways unique, the life of a man who verily practises all that he preaches, of a man who calls no moment of his time his own, of one who, when other men—his colleagues even—sleep or amuse themselves, still spends himself in the service of humanity, finding all needed relaxation in the consciousness of souls recovered or renewed, or in the divine acknowledgment of his humble efforts. A life of that order, wherever passed and however

pervious to the detractions of friendly or hostile observers, must still draw men unto it.

The reader will have already gathered that it is no easy matter to obtain audience of Father John. For myself, I am entirely indebted in this particular to Colonel Gulaev, known in this country as the translator of Father John's book, *My Life in Christ*.

The colonel lives in St. Petersburg on the top flat of a fine mansion in a certain Boulevard, a house that belongs to and is otherwise tenanted by the priests attached to the Cathedral of St. Isaac. He arranged that Father John should call here at a certain hour when next he had occasion to visit the capital. The prospect of his visit had not been mooted beyond Gulaev's drawing-room, yet a small crowd assembled about the street door; people got past the hall porter on various pretexts, and climbed the stairs to seat themselves upon the landings, or take up a position against the balustrade. One young woman, distinctive amongst the other watchers by reason of her sweet, sad countenance, and tasteful dress, was invited by the courteous colonel, on one of his expectant sallies to the entrance door, to pass the time of waiting in his rooms. There she narrated to his sympathetic wife that her father, stricken with tubercular disease of the bones, had been given up by the physicians, but she believed that Father John could yet save him, and at the worst she wished to carry his blessing to him. But the hour came and went; the healer did not appear, and the girl was hardly comforted with a phial of holy water that had been blessed by the renowned priest and was now offered to her by her kindly hostess.

Later it appeared that he had been carried off by the wife of one of the merchant princes, who had often tried to arrange an interview with him, and had even passed a night in his hostelry at Kronstadt only to receive his

blessing in the morning. That day she caught him in St. Petersburg, and he had become so engrossed in conversation with her that he forgot his pre-arranged engagement. The colonel could merely try again. A service at St. Isaac's, where Father John rarely officiates, to be followed by a meal (over which he was to pronounce a blessing) at the senior priest's house, seemed to offer a suitable opportunity for carrying out the unfulfilled pledge of a previous day.

"It is certain that he will come to-day," said Gulaev, "and you see the people know it." He points as he speaks to the courtyard at the back of his lodging, which is visible from his windows, and from which alone there appears to be access to the senior priest's apartments in a detached building railed off on another side of the yard. A few persons are standing about, but gradually their numbers increase, the windows round about are thrown up and occupied, and a hum of suppressed excitement rises from the court below. At last the feelings of the people pass beyond their control, and they rush to meet another human wave that at this moment rolls in through the archway that leads from the street parallel to, and behind the Boulevard, in to the yard. The incoming wave bears the other back by sheer force of weight, but for a moment its course is checked, and the seething mass resolves itself into a human maelstrom. The centre of the commotion is at brief intervals seen to be a man of medium height, dressed in the ordinary black gown and felt hat of a priest. On his left he is supported by a yard porter, and on his right by an admiring military officer. The people throng him, and with great difficulty his attendants make a passage for him, while he moves his hands about—nay they are thrown about—so that the people may kiss them. And those who achieve this good fortune instantly disappear with a solemn or a pleased expression upon their countenances to make

way for others. He is borne on, however, and passes through the iron gate into the priest's house. The crowd attempts to press in after him, but is mercilessly pushed back by one or two policemen who have joined it, and the people wait patiently outside. But now the two-horse brougham which he had left in the street drives into the yard and the proprietress, an elderly lady, whose is the privilege of driving the great man on that day, steps out and makes her way into the house. The crowd, three-quarters of which are women, now fills the whole yard, and it looks as if the carriage were blocked in. The door is opened, but only to receive the little old lady with her black bag, who wisely seeks a retreat within. Four yard porters vainly attempt to form a passage for Father John. The people dodge them, slip under their arms, and literally besiege the vehicle. At length he appears; it is a hard struggle. For some moments it seems as if he will not traverse the few feet that separate him from his objective; the stout officer on one side is jostled to the detriment of his temper; the sergeant of police opposite him is driven to issuing sharp, incisive orders to his subordinates, who make a fierce onslaught on the eager surroundings, and the door is safely closed upon the venerable priest. Immediately the people encircle the brougham once again; they push in hands and head at either window. They become utterly reckless; some strive to hold the horses, but the carriage moves at the second attempt. They are flung about by the wheels; they care not. More than one woman has been trampled to death under his horses' feet at Kronstadt. But even now a man is standing on either step, imploring a blessing or begging permission to kiss that hand. Others run after the carriage, but it distances them; their chance is gone.

On the Boulevard a crowd of three or four hundred has gathered. It is always the same. There had been a

similar crush at the cathedral in the morning, causing a policeman, who had been one of Father John's escort, to remark, "Surely now he will need to go back to Kronstadt to recover." The house porter is helpless; the landings are in possession of elderly men and women seated on benches, while those who are younger have pressed up to the highest flat and line the staircase two deep on either side. The doors of the different lodgings are flung open, and as the magician approaches emit their human tribute. He mounts the stairs somewhat rapidly, still supported by his military friend and a porter. At one door he pauses to pay his respects to the senior priest in this building. Incessantly the people press him, crying, "Father, little Father, bless me." And as he passes on he lays his hand upon their heads, or gives it them to kiss. On one landing were gathered several children, some of them in arms, and as he laid his hands upon their heads or took their little faces between them, imprinting a kiss upon their foreheads, one was reminded of a scene familiar since one's earliest recollections. At that moment he happened to look up, and there rested on his face an expression almost divine, while love streamed from the kindest eyes that I have ever looked upon in fellow-man. Gradually he worked his way up to the top landing, the officer continually exclaiming, "Enough, enough," as some more impetuous admirer would not go away without a blessing. But Gulaev's door was at last shut behind him and greetings were interchanged. For the moment the devoted colonel was absolutely overcome with emotion, and broke down. At once Father John went up to him, patted him on the back, and with a few cheery words helped him to recover his wonted equilibrium. But in such an affection Gulaev was not alone. "I cannot see you, you are so holy," the senior priest had said to him with deepest feeling on the landing below.

Let me take him as he sits at table over tea and biscuits,

listening carefully to certain questions with which Gulaev plies him. He is a man of medium height, who does not look his years. A high forehead, heavily lined, rises over two eyes that shine with a light of excessive kindliness. The face, especially round about the eyes, is deeply wrinkled, and often assumes an expression of intense weariness. The long, scant hair, divided in the middle, is yielding the earlier auburn to a severer grey; the beard and moustache, by no means long in proportion, are more pronouncedly grizzled. The cheeks are somewhat red; it is a face like a benediction. He seems to put his whole soul into everything that he does. He looks you steadily in the face the while you speak to him. He makes you feel that he has given himself up entirely to you and to your interests for the time being. You see that, in any case, he is a strong man—very level-headed, not easily put out—one who quickly grasps a situation and enters fully into it. You ask him a question; he pauses for a moment to consider it, and then gives a clear, pointed response. One had been told to expect a shy, nervous man; there was no trace of these qualities. He is a born leader of men; you feel instinctively that you are in the presence of no ordinary being. A man of naturally liberal tendencies, he proves to be hopelessly conservative along certain well-marked lines of opinion. Tell him that in certain far-off islands of the sea people have found genuine pleasure and help in the perusal of his book, and he bows in grateful humility. Above his name he always inscribes a cross; it is the secret of his life. He is the same affectionate, sympathetic soul to every one, particularly loving to lay his hands over the children's heads and bless them. Now he seats himself by Gulaev's well-furnished table, but will not taste vodka. He enters into general conversation, asking if a certain fish he is eating at that moment is found in our country. Thither he will probably never go—the language

would be too great a difficulty—but he found the word “indifferent,” on the occasion of some slight table mischance, with evident amusement to himself. In the end he quietly asks his host if he can do him any further favour, and then announces that he must go farther on.

Meanwhile, the people wait outside, and as he passes to the street there is the same wild demonstration. The number of spectators has doubled itself. As he passes down the stair he gives pound notes to two women. This is a favourite habit; in the distribution he seems to trust to some unusual instinct: for, in many cases, it has been found subsequently that his charity was well deserved where he had dispensed it. Many pressed close to ask some rule for the guidance of their lives, others sought his blessing; one poor woman simply kissed his hand, and he gave her a note. And through it all he ever wears that sad, wistful expression of overflowing love. “Was his face not as the face of Christ?” said Madame Gulaev, when her door was shut upon him.

For some years past endeavours have been made to promote closer relations between the Church of England and the Russian Church. It need hardly be said that such ideas, which do not stop short of actual union, will mainly be found amongst members of the High Church party. It may be questioned whether these negotiations have ever got, or will ever get, beyond the stage of a polite interchange of courtesies. But the project is sufficiently well known in St. Petersburg to make it worth while to ask Father John what he thought and felt about possible future union of the English and Russian Churches. In answer to a request for an expression of opinion upon this point, Father John remarked how in Christ’s last prayer He had asked that the men whom God had given Him out of the world, and those who believe on Him through their word, might be one, even as He and His Father were one. “For

a thousand years," continued the Saint of Kronstadt, "the Russian Church has prayed for the union of all churches; and when I read the Liturgy every day there is no portion that I pray more sincerely." But when pressed for anything more definite, his conservatism became very apparent, and one saw that any union would merely be absorption of the English Church into the larger Russian community. "Union might be possible," he would say, "if the English Church will accept our dogmas of faith; but we will never give up, for example, the worship of the Virgin Mary."

Still, it would hardly be fair to characterize him as narrow. He speaks of Church differences as partitions which men have reared between themselves. When in the house of a certain orthodox Count, he was asked to pray. A Lutheran admiral who was present interposed for a moment, saying that perhaps Father John might not care to have the little service when he, an outsider, was in the room. "Our differences would not reach to heaven," he replied, and the service proceeded.

To attempt to account for Father John's wonderful influence, involves the recognition of several factors. His influence is undoubtedly due in part to his preaching. Some of his sermons are published—subject, of course, to revision by the Censor—but he is described, by those who have heard him, as a powerful preacher, although I question whether by that phrase they meant all that we would understand by the designation. Whenever he officiates in the Kronstadt Cathedral, the crowd is overpowering, and the verger shows with pride the stout movable rail that is used to partition off the choir, remarking that it has twice been broken through by the infatuated listeners in their struggles to get near the man. Colonel Gulaev is at present engaged in translating some of these sermons.

But, to go further back; he early attracted notice and won sympathy by his absolute indifference to money. This

set him at once in marked contrast to his Kronstadt colleagues in the ministry ; indeed, it separated him off from the great mass of the Russian clergy. In Kronstadt the priests appear to have a fixed salary, of perhaps £4 per annum ; for the rest, as we have seen, they are dependent upon what they receive from their parishioners. Father John asked for nothing from the beginning. He went about helping the people, expecting nothing ; and when money gifts were offered to him, he either refused to take them or would accept only to give away to some one less fortunate than himself. This feature in his character is still prominent ; so that although many thousands of rubles are gifted to him annually, he often has barely sufficient for the necessities of life. For this and other reasons he is unpopular amongst those of his own vocation, especially with his colleagues at Kronstadt. The latter receive perhaps one ruble (two shillings) for giving the sacrament to some poor person ; but all the people now go to Father John, and thus deprive the other priests of rightful methods of adding to their slender incomes. His generosity has already been remarked on more than once. Many stories are told of him which all seem to be variants at least of one particular form of incident, and therefore certainly of some one particular incident. In this type of story he is represented as walking along the street with a rich merchant, whose wife has received blessing, physical or spiritual, through his prayers and ministrations. The merchant has previously given him a handsome donation, which the healer accepts for one of his institutions. Their walk is, however, disturbed by a poor girl, who importunately tells him her tale of misery. The priest puts his hand into his pocket, takes out the envelope lately given by the wealthy trader, and hands it to the girl. "Stop!" cries the distressed merchant, "there are a thousand rubles in that envelope." "That is only her luck," answers the

serene consoler, and the abashed merchant subsides into silence.

In a *Times* communication of January 13th, 1891, the St. Petersburg correspondent, Mr. George Dobson, says: "His extraordinary healing powers, and the spiritual and bodily cures effected by the faithful acceptance of his earnest consolations, are attested on all sides by many sorts and conditions of men. To those who believe in Father John—and their name is legion—the age of miracles is not yet over." The people certainly believe that he can work miracles, although the credulity and superstition amongst them almost passes imagination. Still there are authenticated cases of recovery in answer to his prayers when the physicians had abandoned all hope. Those over whom he prays he solemnly entreats to believe in God and in His power to restore them. And so the father of the girl who sought him at Gulaev's house, and had to depart content with holy water, passed a restful night. One instance of a cure may be given, in which the patient is known to myself—the daughter of a Government official. A delicate girl, she had accompanied her father on a visit to this country at the time of the Jubilee celebrations, and on the journey home caught a chill of more than ordinary severity that left her deaf in both her ears. The efforts of the family physician and of an ear specialist were vain, and in his despair her father applied to the renowned priest, telling him exactly what had happened, and mentioning the doctor's insistence on the necessity of keeping the girl free from all damp. Father John prayed with her and touched her ears with holy water, if he did not actually pour some in; and she recovered her hearing. In the popular lives of Father John there is always at least one chapter in which are related at some length more or less remarkable cases of his successful mediation. It is a difficult question of which it is possible to seek for an explana-

tion either in the man, or in those who wait on him. These explanations will differ greatly in the two cases: in the one a solution will be sought in some special indwelling of Divine power in the healer, and on *a priori* grounds there is nothing inherently improbable in such an explanation; in the other case the credulity and superstitious tendency of the subjects will be adduced and emphasized. Many of the chronicled cures will doubtless not bear examination, but a residuum is left of which the most satisfactory rendering will be obtained by the help of the former, rather than of the latter clue; but the second is by no means to be despised in part.

His influence extends over all classes in the land, but his attitude to one and all is the same. Many people in this country first heard of him when he was summoned to the bedside of the dying Emperor Alexander III., and remained with him to the end. The present Empress kisses his hand no less than the humblest peasant, and, like a loyal priest, Father John preaches to the people that Christ is the head of the Church, and that the Emperor is the first son of God. He receives requests for prayer from all over the world. An American lady solicited his prayers for her people in the late war. He complied with her request, but with reluctance, saying that it was a war between two good peoples. He loves the warrior population amongst whom he lives, and many of them sincerely admire and love him. His life is an admirable example illustrative of what he considers to be the two fundamental requirements of them that would serve God in His ministry, viz., a living faith in God, and sincere devotion to Jesus Christ and to the Church which He founded.

When one considers the man and the extraordinary influence that he is exerting at the present time, one naturally wonders whether he will not, one day, be enrolled amongst the Russian saints. The canon of the saints is

not yet closed. It is only three years since St. Theodosius of Tchernigov was added in consequence of the wonders worked by his relics. I am not certain on what principles men are elected to a place amongst the saints; it would seem to be in part connected with the state in which their remains are found on examination at some long interval after their decease, and it will be three or four hundred years before Father John is thus, if ever, honoured. Still, one cannot help feeling that the Russian people have at the present time the opportunity of observing at first hand one of their future saints. But whether this be so or no, they at least have furnished to them in Father John a most effective exemplar of Him who went about doing good.

J. Y. SIMPSON.

ST. PAUL'S CORRESPONDENCE WITH CORINTH.

A REJOINDER.

MR. WHITE'S able and interesting article in the February (1898) number of the *EXPOSITOR* was a valuable contribution to the discussion of the theory which I had ventured in the preceding year to lay before the readers of the September and October Numbers. A theory, if true, has nothing to dread, but has everything to hope, from the result of honest and able criticism; the most dangerous foes of a new truth are inattention and neglect.

I think it will be well to preface my rejoinder to this criticism of Mr. White by stating as clearly as I can the points at issue between us.

Some of these points bear on the question of the date of 1 Corinthians, and it is possible that some critics may assent to these who are unwilling to accept my other conclusions. I will therefore take these first. On this question I hold that 1 Corinthians was not written (as is

generally supposed) in the spring of the same year in which St. Paul left Ephesus, but considerably earlier (probably in the spring of the year before); and that consequently it cannot be the Epistle about whose reception by the Corinthians Titus brought the first news to St. Paul after he had left Ephesus and gone into Macedonia.

One of the lines of proof leading to this conclusion is connected with a journey of the Apostle to Corinth which is not mentioned in Acts, but which is, as I believe, referred to more than once in 2 Corinthians. Mr. White is quite correct in thinking that I believe this journey to be a most important element in the determination of the chronology of St. Paul's correspondence with Corinth. Its importance was at once perceived by Paley, though he looked on it as a purely disturbing element. Speaking of one of the passages which I am now about to examine, he writes: "I own that I felt myself confounded by this text. It appeared to contradict the opinion which I had been led by a great variety of circumstances to form concerning the date and occasion of the epistle." And a little earlier he says that if 2 Corinthians xiii. 1 imports that the writer had been at Corinth twice before, it overthrows every congruity which he has been endeavouring to establish.

Those who maintain the traditional date of 1 Corinthians must necessarily adopt one or other of two courses with respect to this question. They must either deny that any such journey took place at all, or they must endeavour to place it before the date of 1 Corinthians.

I have already, in the *EXPOSITOR* for October, given some proofs which appear to me to render the latter of these two solutions an impossible one. Mr. White agrees with me in this, but adopts the more radical mode of solution by denying the journey altogether.

The validity of this mode of solution has to be de-

terminated by the interpretation of three passages, *i.e.* 2 Corinthians xii. 14, 2 Corinthians xiii. 1, 2, 3, and 2 Corinthians ii. 1.

In his examination of the first of these passages Mr. White calls special attention to the expression *ἐτοίμως ἔχω*, I am *ready* to come to you, which he considers to be so strongly in favour of his contention that the Apostle is not referring to three actual visits but only to three occasions on which he has been ready to visit Corinth, that it can be made use of to determine in a like sense the rendering of the second passage 2 Corinthians xiii. 1, which if taken by itself would, as he admits, appear to be against him.

In this contention he has most of the leading commentators against him. They hold, and I believe rightly hold, that the words *ἐτοίμως ἔχω* do not of themselves determine the matter at all; for it is quite as admissible to connect the *τρίτον τοῦτο* with the *ἐλθεῖν* as with them; so that we may either translate the passage, "Behold this is the third time that I am in readiness to come to you" or "Behold I am ready to come to you this third time."

The sentences which follow immediately after may, I think, help us to see which of these renderings gives us the true meaning of the writer; for in them he informs his readers that during this coming visit he intends to live at his own charges, and to make no demand upon their hospitality. In this connection a reference to previous visits in which he had adopted the same independent course would be pertinent and appropriate; but visits which had not been paid in the body but only in intention could not possibly have made demands on the hospitality of the Corinthians, so that it would be difficult to discover what possible connection the mention of them could have with the Apostle's argument in this passage.

I think, therefore, that even this text, which Mr. White

regards as specially favourable to his supposition, favours rather the supposition of visits actually paid, when it is taken in connection with its context. The most decisive utterance, however, is that which is found in 2 Corinthians xiii. 1, 2. This is a passage whose importance and interest demands and repays a careful exegesis.

For the second of these verses two rival translations are proposed; and, if it is possible to determine which of these is right, it is possible also to determine whether the disputed visit was really paid or no. The first translation which is adopted by Mr. White, and by other critics to whose authority he appeals, renders *ὥς* by "as if," making it introduce a fictitious supposition. Mr. White does not say how he translates *καί*; but most of the commentators to whom he here appeals render it by "though." This latter rendering appears indeed to be almost a necessary consequence of the meaning given by them to *ὥς*; for if *καί* were the simple copulative here, it would be necessary either to regard both the suppositions which it connects (the presence and the absence) as fictitious, or to regard them both as real.

The alternative translation renders *ὥς* by "as," and supposes *οὕτως* to be omitted before *καί*. This is the rendering adopted in the text of the Revised Version. "As when I was present the second time, so now, being absent." The other rendering is given by the Revisers in the margin.

We have an instance of a similar omission of *οὕτως* before *καί* in Galatians i. 9—a passage which furnishes a most striking and suggestive parallel to this—*ὥς προειρήκαμεν καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω*.

If we confined our attention to the words *ὥς* and *καί*, either translation would be admissible. It is the context which must decide between them.

And first I would note the writer's introduction of the

word *νῦν*. He evidently meant something by it; and it appears from its position in the sentence to be intended to mark a contrast in time between the *παρών* and the *ἀπών*. The probability that there is such a time contrast intended becomes stronger when we extend our view to the previous clause "*προείρηκα καὶ προλέγω*"; for in this clause we have an analogous difference in time between two verbs, which makes them appear to correspond respectively to the participles—*προείρηκα* to *παρών*, and *προλέγω* to *ἀπών νῦν*. Nor can it be objected that if this were the true connection of the passage, each participle should have been placed immediately after its verb; for the sentence gains in rhetorical force by the present arrangement, which places the two warnings in juxtaposition. "I have warned, and I warn, as when I was present, so also when I am absent now."

The following clause—"τοῖς προημαρτηκόσι καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν"—still further continues the parallelism, the *πρό* of the *προημαρτηκόσι* marking the same difference of time between the pair contained in this clause as has been shown to exist between each of the pairs in the previous clauses, and in the same order. We have thus three pairs in perfect correspondence. It may be noted in passing that those who are spoken of as *τοῖς προημαρτηκόσι* are evidently the same as those whom the writer has referred to in xii. 21 as *τῶν προημαρτηκότων καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων*.

It will hardly be denied that the *προείρηκα* of xiii. 2 refers to a real occurrence; so that once the connection between the clauses of the paragraph is perceived, it becomes impossible any longer to regard the corresponding participle *παρών* as fictitious. But the question has further to be asked, On what occasion did the Apostle previously make the announcement, "If I come again, I will not spare"? The supposition that this previous warn-

ing was given in a letter or through a messenger seems to be forbidden by the connection of the verb with *ὡς παρών*. In short the connection between these two clauses excludes two suppositions, either of which would otherwise have been admissible. If the *προείρηκα* had stood alone, it might have referred to an announcement made by letter. If the *ὡς παρών* stood alone, it might be interpreted of a fictitious presence. But the conjunction of the two must refer to an announcement delivered during a visit which was really paid by the Apostle to the Corinthian Church.

There are other considerations which strongly confirm this view. The introduction of the supposition of a fictitious presence with the argument would not only have been objectless, but would have destroyed the force of the warning which the Apostle is uttering with such emphasis; for it would have made him say that if he were already present on his coming visit, he would utter by word of mouth the identical warning which he is sending to them now by letter; whereas he is expressly telling them that when he visits them next he will not do what he is doing now, but something altogether different—that he will then no longer threaten but perform.

Furthermore, if the journey is denied, the *δεύτερον* and the *τρίτον* refer to the same future visit, the *δεύτερον* being got by counting only real visits, the *τρίτον* by adding an intended visit. The latter mode of enumerating would be somewhat peculiar. Number one is a visit, number two an intention which was never carried out, and this is number three. Such a mode of enumerating would have suggested the too obvious question, "Will then number three be like number one, or like number two? Will it be an intention which will be carried out or an intention which will not be carried out?"

But once the reality of the disputed visit is acknowledged, the mode of enumerating becomes consistent and

intelligible throughout. The introduction of the word *δεύτερον* so soon after the mention of *τρίτον*, instead of causing confusion, as it would if they referred to the same approaching visit, becomes apposite and forcible. The whole paragraph represents an ordered progress to a fore-announced judicial act. The Apostle had warned the Corinthians when he was present with them on his second visit, "If I come again, I will not spare." He is now about to come again, and on the eve of his third visit he reiterates the warning which he gave on his second.

Mr. White does not enter on the exegesis of 2 Corinthians ii. 1, but relies on 2 Corinthians xii. 14 and 2 Corinthians xiii. 1, 2, to determine the interpretation of this text also in his favour. I have endeavoured to show that the passages on which he relies are in reality strongly against him. As regards 2 Cor. ii. 1 taken by itself, all critics agree that the order of words as they are found in the oldest manuscripts—*μὴ πάλιν ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν*—tends to establish the reality of the disputed visit. For, if strictly interpreted according to that order, they represent St. Paul as having already visited Corinth once ἐν λύπῃ; and the nature of this λύπη is determined by the verse which immediately follows, "For if I make you sorry," *εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ λυπῶ ὑμᾶς*, and also by the word *φειδόμενος* which precedes it. These expressions show that the λύπη has reference to the severity which the Apostle felt himself compelled to exercise, and cannot be explained by any trials of his own such as those which he had to endure before his first visit to Corinth.

The evidence for the disputed journey furnished by these three passages is so strong that I believe it would long ago have been admitted by all commentators were it not for the difficulties by which they found themselves met, when they attempted to place it before 1 Corinthians. The real strength of the arguments of its opponents has always

lain in the proofs which they could bring to show the impossibility of doing this. But the disinclination to admit its reality which has thus been caused has, I think, been strengthened by the notion that if it had really taken place, it would have been mentioned in the Acts. How little justification there is for this notion may be seen from a passage in one of the very epistles with which we are dealing. In the eleventh chapter of 2 Corinthians St. Paul tells us, "Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one."

Not one of these occasions is mentioned in the Acts. "Thrice was I beaten with rods." One only of these scourgings is recorded—that which took place at Philippi. And—most important of all in its bearing on our subject—we also read, "Thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day have I been in the deep."

Not one of these shipwrecks is mentioned in the Acts; for, of course, the shipwreck recorded in the twenty-seventh chapter of Acts occurred long after the date of this epistle.

If such thrilling events as shipwrecks have been passed over without the slightest notice, we have no right to feel any difficulty because the narrative omits to mention a voyage of about ten days or a fortnight on a frequented route between two of the greatest seaports of the ancient world, where large and swift vessels were constantly passing to and fro. St. Luke was not with St. Paul during the latter's stay at Ephesus, so that very little is told us of the events of those three years till we come to the riot which took place at their close. Not one of those plots of the Jews which St. Paul speaks of in his address to the elders of Ephesus is so much as mentioned in the direct narrative.

If then there is no reason for denying the occurrence of the visit except the difficulty of placing it before 1 Corinthians, the question arises, May it not have taken place between the dates of these two epistles. The only objection to this solution is the notion that the composition of 1

Corinthians must be placed between the events recorded in Acts xix. 22 and 23, and that it is the letter referred to in 2 Corinthians. These and these alone were the premises which led Alford to the conclusion (referred to by Mr. White) that there was no room for a visit between the sending of 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians. It is the assumption of the truth of these premises which has necessitated the attempts of some commentators to explain away the journey by strained interpretations of the passages which speak of it, and the not less forced attempts of others to place the visit before 1 Corinthians. The proper course in such a condition of things is to raise the question, Are we certain that the premises, which necessitate these strained interpretations, are true?

This course would suggest itself even if we had no other evidence for the earlier date of 1 Corinthians than that which is connected with the question of the visit. But we have other quite independent evidence of the strongest kind in favour of this earlier date. I have already in the *EXPOSITOR* for October endeavoured to call attention to the fact that, while St. Paul in 1 Corinthians xvi. gives directions about the establishment of a system of weekly collections in such terms as clearly show us that a beginning of these collections had yet to be made, in 2 Corinthians he says that he has been boasting of them that they were ready a year ago.

This system of weekly collections was admirably suited to the circumstances of a community such as the Christian Church at Corinth, where not many mighty, not many noble, had been called. Poor men, many of whom were probably weekly wage earners, and some of whom were slaves, could not give much at once, though out of their small means they might put by a little every week. This would take time, so that two or three months at the least must elapse before they could be said to be ready. Even if we

suppose that they commenced the collections immediately on Titus' arrival, this would bring the date of their readiness very near midsummer, supposing him to have come about Easter. How then could the Apostle, writing in the autumn of the same year, say that he had been boasting of them that they were ready a year ago?

Mr. White's reply is that "*ἀπὸ πέρυσι* may very well be rendered 'last year,' a term that we might use in February when speaking of something that had taken place in the previous November or December, especially when, as in these places, the writer's intention is to make the most of the interval which had elapsed."

I should have thought that those would be the very circumstances under which we would have no right to do anything of the kind, and that if we did so, our hearers or readers would be disposed either to laugh at or to resent any serious attempt on our part to employ a purely arbitrary division of time such as New Year's Day in order to make the most of an interval.

This would be the case even now when all the nations of western and central Europe have the same New Year's Day. In St. Paul's time there would have been still less temptation to adopt this device; for different men had different New Year's Days according as they used the Jewish, or the Greek, or the Roman calendar. Mr. White and the commentators who agree with him evidently assume that St. Paul used the calendar of the Greeks; for that is the only calendar which places New Year's Day where their argument requires it to be. But, as Zahn has remarked, we cannot in this connection leave the Roman calendar out of our reckoning, as St. Paul was writing to a Roman colony, and very possibly from another Roman colony. The Roman calendar put New Year's Day on the 1st January, which would not suit the argument at all.

If the proofs here given establish the fact that 1 Cor-

inthians was written at least a year before the traditionally assigned date, that conclusion is of itself one of great interest. It is possible to admit this fact without admitting that part of my theory which has to do with 2 Corinthians. The only way, however, of avoiding the necessity for this further step is to adopt the hypothesis of a lost epistle; for if 1 Corinthians was written a year before St. Paul's departure from Ephesus, it cannot possibly be the epistle referred to in 2 Corinthians as having been written with anguish and tears, and of whose reception by the Corinthians tidings were first brought by Titus to the Apostle after he had left Ephesus.

In the September and October (1897) numbers of the *EXPOSITOR* I laid before its readers a number of proofs that that epistle is not altogether lost, for that we have in 2 Corinthians x.-xiv. the latter portion of it.

The proofs of this are cumulative; but those on which I laid most stress were derived from three passages in 2 Corinthians i.-ix., in which the Apostle was avowedly speaking of the missing letter and in which I contended that he plainly referred to three corresponding passages in 2 Corinthians x.-xiv.; and I called attention to the fact that in each of these pairs of passages the act or purpose or feeling which in 2 Corinthians x.-xiii. is present or future, in 2 Corinthians i.-ix. is spoken of as belonging to the past. To my argument from these pairs of parallel passages I have not yet seen any reply.

Mr. White devotes a considerable part of his reply to meeting one of the lines of proof which I had brought forward, and which was derived from the fact that whereas in the first nine chapters the Apostle almost exhausts the resources of language in describing the fulness of his joy at the reconciliation of the Corinthian Church to himself after a temporary estrangement in 2 Corinthians x.-xiv. he speaks of the estrangement as present and not past.

I had endeavoured to show the untenable nature of two modes of explanation of this difficulty which had hitherto been extensively adopted, viz. the assertion that the first nine chapters are addressed to a repentant majority and the four concluding chapters to an unrepentant minority; and the hypothesis that after St. Paul had written the first nine chapters fresh news arrived of a very different kind from the favourable report which Titus had brought.

Mr. White, with characteristic originality and independence, throws both these attempted explanations overboard and brings forward one of his own.

His explanation is that "the same persons are addressed, but from totally different points of view, the motive of the first part of the letter being the repentance of the Corinthians for their immorality and profanity, the theme of the second being the increased encouragement which at the same time they were giving to the party who depreciated the apostolic character of St. Paul."

Mr. White has not quoted any passages from these nine chapters in support of his theory; nor would it be fair to blame him for this, for among the passages which speak of the repentance of the Corinthians and of their reception of St. Paul's messenger with fear and trembling there is not one in which there is any express mention made of their previous immorality and profaneness; so that it would be impossible to quote what was not there. I think the theory must rest on the assumption that the offender mentioned in the second and seventh chapters of 2 Corinthians is to be identified with the incestuous person whose case is mentioned in 1 Corinthians. If this is so, it is rather unfortunate for the theory that in the seventh chapter St. Paul expressly says that his only reason for referring to the case of the now repentant offender (whoever he was) was the bearing of his case on the relation of the Corinthian Church to himself: "I wrote not for his cause that did the wrong, nor

for his cause that suffered the wrong, but that your earnest care for us might be made manifest unto you in the sight of God."

Some critics maintain with considerable probability that this declaration of St. Paul shows that the "offender" of 2 Corinthians is not the incestuous person at all, for that St. Paul, who felt most strongly the enormity of sins of that nature, would never have spoken thus about so terrible a moral offence. In any case both here and throughout these nine chapters the acknowledgment by the Corinthians of St. Paul's authority is the predominant thought. I am not surprised at this, for I fully agree with Mr. White that "the permanent discrediting of St. Paul and the triumph of his opponents would have been fatal to the very existence of the Catholic Church."

Mr. White makes much of the fact that there is not a shred of external testimony from either MSS., Versions, or Christian writers, that the integrity of 2 Corinthians was ever doubted until the eighteenth century. My answer is that neither is there a shred of evidence from any of these sources for an Epistle to the Corinthians prior to our 1 Corinthians, yet this apparently overwhelming negative evidence does not prevent the vast majority of commentators from believing that such an epistle once existed on the strength of a single allusion in 1 Corinthians v. 9; for it is felt that there is no conflict of testimony here. Evidence in favour of an occurrence cannot be disproved by the evidence of a thousand reliable witnesses who visited the spot without seeing anything, if their visit was considerably later than the date of the alleged occurrence. That is the precise relation of the evidence of the succeeding manuscripts and versions either to the total or partial loss of an epistle before the first copy had been made. The business of later scribes was simply to copy the manuscript as it was delivered to the Church at large by the local Church to

which it was originally addressed. If a mistake was made in the first copy and the original then destroyed, they had no means of getting behind the copy to correct the mistake. Many modern Biblical critics seem to have substituted for all other infallibilities this infallible canon, that external evidence is reliable, and is conservative in its tendency, while internal evidence is misleading and revolutionary. There is no such short cut to truth to save us the trouble of using the power of discrimination which God has given to man. There is good and bad internal evidence, and there is good and bad external evidence. In this case I believe that the result of the internal evidence will be revolutionary only in appearance, but in reality will be thoroughly conservative in its tendency; for it replaces discrepancies by harmonies, and it vindicates St. Paul from the imputation of inconsistencies which he never committed, but which are fathered on him by commentators in their attempt to save the traditional theory.

J. H. KENNEDY.

*A HISTORICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE
TO THE GALATIANS.*

LI. VOLUNTARY LIBERALITY TO TEACHERS (VI. 6-10).

THIS paragraph continues the subject of the last: Paul is still engaged with the dangers to which the Galatian Churches are exposed through their proneness to certain faults. He now urges them to treat with wise liberality their religious teachers, to persevere and not to lose heart in beneficence generally, to take advantage of every opportunity of doing good to all with whom they are brought into contact, but more especially to their Christian brethren, "the members of the household of the faith."

This is only a further exposition of what is involved in

the "Whole Law for the Christian, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." That "Whole Law" was quoted in v. 14; and the remaining verses have been devoted to explaining its consequences and its meaning to the Galatians in their special situation and with their special temperament.

The duty of every congregation to support liberally the ministers of the Word is mentioned, not merely to the Galatians here, but also to the Corinthians (1 *Cor.* ix. 11; 2 *Cor.* xi. 7 f.), to the Philippians (iv. 10 f.), to the Thessalonians (1 *Thess.* ii. 6, 9), to the Asian Churches (1 *Tim.* v. 17, 18). Paul kept it before the attention of the Churches of all the four Provinces—Achaia, Macedonia, Asia, and Galatia.

The duty was one that was quite novel in ancient society. It was something that no convert from Paganism had been accustomed to.

There was no system of instruction in the Pagan religions. The favour of the gods was gained by acts of ritual, not by moral conduct. Every prayer for help was a deliberate bargain; the worshipper promised certain gifts to the god, on condition that the god gave the help implored. The priests had the right to certain dues, a sort of percentage, on all sacrifices and offerings, and these dues were paid in various ways. A fee had to be paid for entrance into the temples;¹ or a part of the victim offered went to the priest; or other methods were practised. In one way or another, the priesthoods of the Pagan gods were so lucrative

¹ *Mercedem pro aditu sacri*, Tertullian, *Apologet.* 13 and commentators. In the Roman world generally, fees were imposed for entering the temple, for approaching the place of sacrifice, for the presentation of gifts or the offering of sacrifice; and the collecting of the fees was farmed out by the State. Sometimes the right to engage in worship and sacrifice without payment of fees was granted to individuals (*immunitas sacrum faciendorum*, *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vi. 712). A tariff of charges is published, *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vi. 820, Henzen 6113. This custom is hardly known in republican times, except that Cicero, *Leg.* 10, 25, says *sumptū ad sacra addito deorum aditu arceamus*.

in Asia Minor that they were put regularly up to auction by the State, and knocked down for a term to the highest bidder; and various inscriptions record the exact prices paid for them in some cities.¹ But all these methods take the form of a tariff of dues upon rites which the worshipper performs for his own advantage. There were no instructors, and no voluntary contributions for their support.

Hence the duty of supporting preachers had to be continually impressed upon the attention of all Paul's converts from Paganism. The tendency to fail in it was practically universal; it was connected with a universal fact in contemporary society; perhaps it was not unconnected with a universal characteristic of human nature.

It is therefore quite unjustifiable in the North-Galatian theorists to find in this precept which Paul delivered to the Galatians an indication of their Celtic nature and Celtic blood; and it is quite unfair to quote as an illustration the Gaulish tendency to raid and plunder, or the Gaulish greed for money. It would be more to the point if those theorists were to quote in illustration of this passage the parsimony of King Deiotaros, whose presents were considered by his friend and advocate, Cicero, to be rather mean.² Here we have a distinct analogy between Paul's Galatians and a great North-Galatian king. But parsimony is not by any means confined to a single nation, and is at least as common and characteristic a fault in Asia generally as in the Celtic lands; Armenians and Phœnicians and Jews have been and are as penurious and economical as King Deiotaros or any other Celt.

One of the objects that Paul had most at heart was to train his converts in voluntary liberality, as distinguished

¹ See especially the great inscription of Erythræ of the second century b.c.; it has been often published. See Michel *Recueil d'Inscr. Gr.* 839.

² Cicero *ad Fam.* ix. 12, 2. I do not remember any reference to this passage in the North-Galatian commentators, but should be glad to accept correction on the point.

from payments levied on ritual. He saw what a powerful, educative influence such liberality exerts on the individual, and what a strong unifying influence it might exert between the scattered parts of the Church. The contribution in Antioch for the relief of the sufferers from famine in Judæa (*Acts* xi. 29, xii. 25)—the joint contribution of the "Churches of the Four Provinces" for the benefit of the poor congregation in Jerusalem, poor in comparison with the duties and opportunities open to it¹—were devices at once of a teacher training his pupils, and of a statesman welding countries and peoples into an organic unity.²

There is no bond so strong to hold men together as the common performance of the same duties and acts. The skilful organizers of the Roman Empire, Augustus and his early ministers, devoted themselves to fabricating such bonds by uniting the parts of every Province with each other, and the separate Provinces with their common head—the Emperor—in the performance of the ritual of the universal imperial religion of "Rome and Augustus."

A common ritual is an immense power among men.³ Even the ritual of such a sham as the imperial religion was a great bond of unity in the empire. But Paul, while he was fashioning and elaborating the external forms of organization that should hold together the world in its brotherhood, never made the mistake of trusting to a mere unity of ritual. He saw clearly that, strong as is the common performance of ritual among men, a stronger and more educative power was needed, the common volun-

¹ On these opportunities, especially of showing hospitality to Jewish or Jewish-Christian pilgrims, and thus promoting the sense of brotherhood among the scattered Jewish communities, see EXPOSITOR, June, 1899, p. 408 f.

² This has never been so well stated as by Rev. F. Rendal in EXPOSITOR, Nov., 1893, p. 321 ff. See also *St. Paul the Trav.*, pp. 287 f., 60 f.

³ Compare, *e.g.*, the power of the Greek Church in holding together within the Turkish Empire races, divided by distance, by want of communication, by diversity of blood and of language (*Church in the Rom. Emp.*, p. 467).

tary performance of duties taken up and carried into effect by the conscious deliberate purpose of individual men and women—not of men alone (so he says to the Galatians more emphatically¹ than to any other people), for in the perfected Divine unity of the Church, as it shall be, not as it is, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female.

It is an important point that Paul requires the beneficence of the Galatians to be extended to all men, and not confined “to them that are of the household of faith,” though the latter have a special claim. Every opportunity is to be seized of benefiting their Pagan neighbours. It would be an interesting thing for all who study the state of society in the Roman Empire to know how far this precept was carried into effect in the Pauline Churches. But evidence is at present miserably defective in regard to such practical matters. The establishment of institutions for the benefit of orphans and exposed children was certainly common in the early Church.²

LII. THE LARGE LETTERS (VI. 11–17).

As in several other cases, Paul ends with a peculiarly direct and personal appeal to his correspondents, summing up afresh the critical points in his letter.

Habitually Paul employed a secretary, to whom he dictated his letters; but his custom was to add a parting message with his own hand as a mark of authenticity: “the salutation of me, Paul, with mine own hand, which is the token in every epistle” (2 *Thess.* iii. 17). He sometimes marks this concluding message as his own by the words as well as by the handwriting, as in *Colossians* iv. 18, 1 *Corinthians* xvi. 21. Sometimes he trusts to the

¹ See § XXXIII.

² See Lightfoot, *Colossians and Phil.*, p. 324; *Cities and Bish. of Phrygia*, ii. p. 546.

handwriting alone, and we may confidently take such concluding paragraphs as *Romans* xvi. 25-37, *Ephesians* iv. 23, 24 as the parting messages in Paul's hand, though in many cases it is difficult to detect the point of transition.

In no other case is the point where Paul takes the pen marked so emphatically as here; and in no other case is the parting message so important. Paul returns to the primary subject after having diverged from it in his eagerness to give counsel and advice to the Galatian Churches. He adds with his own hand a brief and pointed *résumé* of the leading thoughts in the letter; and he arrests attention and concentrates it on the *résumé* at once by the opening words: "Look you in what big letters I wrote with my own hand." In § XXXIX., p. 59, I took the wrong meaning from these words.

The tense "I wrote" is an epistolary usage, especially common in Latin, but also found in Greek: the writer puts himself at the point of view of his readers, so that his own action seems to him to lie in the past, as it must be to them when they read it. Paul rarely employs this epistolary tense,¹ but here it is forced on him by the opening word "Look." He imagines himself to be standing beside his correspondents as they are reading his letter, and to be saying to them, "Look you what big letters Paul used here."

It has been inferred by many from this sentence that Paul's ordinary handwriting was very large. But if that were so, it would be unnecessary for him to say both "with my own hand" and "in big letters." Moreover, those who suppose that a trifling detail, such as the shape or size of Paul's ordinary handwriting, could find room in his mind as he wrote this letter, are mistaking his character. The size of the letters must have some important bearing

¹ A case in *Philemon* 19. Lightfoot also quotes the opening of Polycarp's letter to the Philippians.

on the parting message, or it would not have been mentioned. We must here look for the cause, not in any personal trait, but in some principle of ancient life and custom.

Publicity for documents of importance in modern times is attained by multiplication of copies. In ancient times that method was impossible: anything that had to be brought before the notice of the public must be exposed in a prominent position before the eyes of all, engraved on some lasting material such as bronze or marble. When a document was thus exposed in public, attention was often called to some specially important point, especially at the beginning or end, by the use of larger letters.¹

On this familiar analogy Paul calls attention to the following sentences as containing the critical topics of the letter, and being therefore in bold striking lettering. Lightfoot, who adopts this view,² is probably right in taking *ὡμῶν* as an ethical dative, translating "how large, mark you."

Dr. Deissmann's interpretation of the "large letters," as belonging to the region of pure comedy, has been alluded to in § XIV.³ It is rightly rejected by Meyer-Sieffert.

LIII. THE PARTING MESSAGE.

What, then, are the points which are thus placarded, as it were, before the eyes of the Galatians? They may be specified in a rough list as follows:

1. The advocates of circumcision are persons who wish "to make a pretentious display" in "external rites" (without a thought about spiritual realities).

¹ Examples in Meyer-Sieffert. Others may be found in Pompeian advertisements. Many others known to me are of later date.

² He does not, however, mention the epigraphic custom, but treats the device as if it were special to Paul.

³ *EXPOSITOR*, August, 1898, p. 121.

2. Their object is to avoid persecution for the cross of Christ. There is here no thought of persecution by the Roman State. It is solely persecution by the Jews that is in the apostle's mind. The State, if it punished Christians as such, would be equally ready to punish circumcised and uncircumcised Christians. We are here carried back to a time when persecution of Christians existed only in the form of action originated by Jews, who on various pleas induced either imperial officials or city magistrates to interfere against their personal enemies. This takes us back to a very early stage in history: except in Palestine, such persecution was very unlikely to last much later than the decision of Gallio (*Acts* xviii. 15), which constituted a precedent. In Southern Phrygia and Lycaonia, along the line of the great road between Ephesus and Syria, where Jews were specially numerous and influential, persecution of that kind was most likely to constitute a real danger.

3. The champions of circumcision, so far from being eager that the Gentile converts should keep the whole Law, were themselves far from keeping it completely; but they desired to subject the Galatians to that rite in order that they might "gain credit with the Jews for proselytizing" successfully, and thus increasing the influence, wealth and power of the nation (vi. 13).

4. Paul personally desired no credit except in the cross. He himself regarded circumcision as an external and in itself valueless ceremony. We may gather that he considered the rite to have some symbolical value for the Jews, but absolutely none for the Gentiles: to the latter it was positively hurtful in so far as it tended to withdraw their attention from the real spiritual fact, that a remaking and regeneration of man's nature was essential.

The emphasis which is several times laid on the burdensome nature of the Law, and the inability of the Jews themselves to observe its provisions and requirements, is

one of the most remarkable features in the question that was being fought out within the Christian Church about A.D. 50.

Peter spoke of the Law as "a yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear" (*Acts* xv. 10). Paul assumes in this Epistle as a fundamental fact familiar to the Galatians that no person can fulfil the Law entirely, but that all are liable to the curse pronounced against any one who fails in any point of the Law (iii. 10, compare ii. 14); and it was certainly on this impossibility that Paul's personal deep conviction of his own permanent sinful condition had rested before his conversion.¹

The assumption that this fundamental impossibility was a familiar matter of knowledge to the Galatian Christians² can hardly rest only on a universal admission of such impossibility. It must rest on former teaching; and if so, the teaching must be that of the second journey, when the frank and complete admission made by Peter, and the tacit agreement of the apostolic decree in the practical truth of his admission, were set forth to the Galatians. We cannot doubt that, when Paul delivered this decree to the Galatian congregations to keep (*Acts* xvi. 4), he explained to them fully the circumstances of its enactment, and the meaning which they should attach to it.

Sufficient attention has hardly been given by the commentators to this point. Peter's words to the Council could not have carried much weight unless they had been too obviously true for open dispute: there must have been a belief among the more reasonable Jews, even among those who were personally strict, that the Law was too burdensome for practical life.

¹ See § XXII.

² It must be remembered that this Epistle does not move in the line of new arguments that Paul was right and the Judaizers wrong: its power rests in its being a revivification in the Galatians of their former thoughts and knowledge and experience. See § XIII.

What was the reason for this belief? It must have lain in the new circumstances of the Jews amidst the Roman Empire. A Law, which had been possible in Palestine only for the few most elevated spirits, became too obviously impossible amid the wider society of the empire, when every reasoning Jew perceived the magnificent prospects that were open to his people, if they accommodated themselves in some degree to their situation in the Roman world. Those prospects were both material and spiritual. The Jews as a race have never been blind to prospects of material success for the individual or the nation; and the peace, the order, the security of property, the ease and certainty and regularity of intercourse in the Roman world, with the consequent possibilities of trade and finance on a vast scale, opened up a dazzling prospect of wealth and power. Of old, wherever there was anything approaching to free competition, the Semitic traders of Carthage had beaten Rome in the open market; and the Romans obtained command of the Mediterranean trade only by force of arms. The Jews could now repeat the success of their Carthaginian cousins.

There were also Jews whose vision was filled entirely with the spiritual prospects of the race, the influence that it was exerting, and might in a hundredfold greater degree exercise, on thought and religion, especially among the loftier minds of the Empire. But if they were to exercise properly their legitimate influence in the Roman world, they could not carry out completely the Law with its fully developed ceremonial: they must distinguish in it between that which was spiritually real and that which was mere external and unessential ceremonial.

The question with regard to accommodation to their new situation could not be evaded by the Jews. The Sadducees answered it by perfect readiness to concede anything. The Pharisees originally assumed the impossible attitude of a

firm resolve to concede nothing. Paul's position was that nothing should be conceded that was spiritually real or symbolically valuable, but that mere external and unessential ceremonial should be sacrificed; and he held that this was the attitude of the true Pharisee (Acts xxiii. 6).

LIV. THE CONCLUDING BLESSING AND DENUNCIATION
(vi. 16, 17).

As the letter began in a style unique with Paul, and unlike the ordinary epistolary forms, so it ends. Other letters, as a rule, end with a blessing or benediction. Here the blessing is restricted, and in the restriction a negative is implied: "and as many as shall walk by this rule, peace be on them and mercy"; then are added the more gracious words, "and on the Israel of God" (though even here there lurks a contrast to the Israel after the flesh).

But there follows a note of denunciation: "From henceforth let no man trouble me; for I bear branded on my body the marks of Jesus." In 1 *Corinthians* xvi. 21-24, where there is mingled with the blessing a curse, "if any man loveth not the Lord, let him be accursed," the blessing and the expression of love to all come after the curse, and swallow it up. But here, after a restricted benediction, comes a denunciation, combined with a strong assertion of his authority as the servant of Christ—too emphatic to be forgotten in the brief blessing of the final verse.

What is the reason of this most marked characteristic? Is it merely due to indignation (which the commentators make out to be one of the strongest features in the letter)? Was the writer so angry that even his concluding blessing is marred by a note of denunciation and self-assertion? From v. 13 onwards, he has, apparently, forgotten his indignation, and has impressed on the Galatians in successive paragraphs, from various points of view, the supreme duty of love, the evil of wrath, enmity, strife. Can we suppose

that immediately after this he gives the lie to his own teaching by letting his indignation again get the upper hand, and make itself felt in what are almost the last words of the letter?

It cannot be so. This paragraph is the crowning proof that it is a mistake to read indignation as the chief feature of this letter, and that the interpretation advocated above in § XIV. is true: though "the authoritative tone, of course, is there," yet the emotion that drives him on throughout the letter "is intense and overpowering love and pity for specially beloved children."

But to deal with those children one must always use the note of authority. Here, as everywhere throughout the letter, one recognises, not the proud and sensitive Celtic aristocracy, but the simple, slow, easy-going, obedient, contented, good-tempered, and rather stupid people of the Phrygian country, the ground-stock of the Anatolian plateau.

LV. THE STIGMATA OF JESUS (VI. 17).

The idea that these were marks similar to those inflicted on the Saviour's body at the Crucifixion belongs to the "Dark Ages" of scholarship. The marks are those cut deep on Paul's body by the lictor's rods at Pisidian Antioch¹ and the stones at Lystra, the scars that mark him as the slave of Jesus. This custom to mark slaves by scars—produced by cuts, prevented from closing as they healed, so as to leave broad wounds—is familiar even yet to the observant traveller,² though since slavery was brought to an end in Turkey cases are now few, and will after a few years have ceased to exist.

The same custom existed in the country from ancient

¹ *St. Paul the Trav.*, pp. 107, 304.

² Mrs. Ramsay, *Everyday Life in Turkey*, p. 7.

times. It was practised on the temple slaves from time immemorial;¹ and the Galatian slave owners practised it on their slaves, as Artemidorus mentions, having adopted it from their predecessors in the land.

The idea suggested by Dr. Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 266 ff., that the marks of Jesus are prophylactic, guarding the bearer of them against trouble and evil, is out of keeping with the spirit of the letter² and with the tone of this passage. Meyer-Sieffert's latest edition discusses and rejects that interpretation (ninth edition, 1899, p. 364).

LVI. RESULT OF THE EPISTLE.

So ends this unique and marvellous letter, which embraces in its six short chapters such a variety of vehement and intense emotions as could probably not be paralleled in any other work. It lays bare and open in the most extraordinary degree the nature both of the writer and of the readers.

And this letter is pronounced by some of our friends in Europe to be an accretion of scraps round and between bits of genuine original Pauline writing. How blind and dead to all sense of literature and to all knowledge of life and human nature must the man be who so judges—a mere pedant confined within the narrow walls and the close atmosphere of a schoolroom and a study!

To argue with such critics—happily, for the credit of modern scholarship, a hardly perceptible remnant—would be as absurd as it would have been for Paul to employ to the Galatians a series of arguments addressed to the intellect. In such cases one must see and feel. Those who cannot see and feel for themselves cannot be reached by

¹ The evidence of Lucian, *de dea Syria*, 59, about the temple slaves at Syrian Hierapolis, may be taken as proof of a general custom.

² See § VIII., *EXPOSITION*, July, 1898, p. 23.

argument. You must kindle in them life and power. Paul could do that for the Galatians. Who will do it in the present day?

What was the result of the letter to the Galatians? Was it a success or a failure?

It has been suggested by some North-Galatian Theorists, in explanation of the silence of the historian Luke about their supposed Churches of North Galatia, that the Epistle was a failure, that the Churches of Galatia were lost to Paulinistic Christianity, and that the painful episode was passed over lightly by a historian whose sympathies were so strongly on Paul's side.

That is the only serious and reasonable attempt to explain the silence of Luke as to the North-Galatian Churches. The customary explanation, that the silence is merely one more of the strange gaps that seem to North-Galatian Theorists to be the most remarkable feature in the *Acts*, is really an appeal to unreason. Almost all the supposed gaps are the result of the North-Galatian Theory, directly or indirectly, and have no existence when that theory is discarded; and the rest have been shown to be due to some other misapprehension.¹ The "Gap-Theory" first creates the gaps, and then infers that the historian cannot be judged according to the ordinary rules because his work is full of "gaps." In regard to any other historian of good rank and class, the principle is admitted that an interpretation which rests on the supposition of an unintelligible gap must yield to an explanation which shows order and method and purpose ruling in the work.

But the explanation quoted above is reasonable, and calls for serious consideration. It does not, however, stand the test of careful dispassionate examination.

The confidence that Paul expresses as to the issue, v. 10, is not a hasty and rash trust in his own power. It comes

¹ *St. Paul the Trav., passim.*

out at the close of a careful weighing of the situation, in which Paul looks into the hearts of his old converts, and reaches the full certainty and knowledge that he has them with him. His knowledge of human nature gives him the confidence that he expresses.

Moreover, the history of Christianity in Asia Minor during the immediately following period shows that the victory was won once and for ever. The question never again emerges. A few years later we see what was the state of another Phrygian Church, that of Colossæ, in which Judaic influence was very strong. But it is clear that the Galatian difficulty never affected them. The Epistle to the Colossians is "specially anti-Judaistic,"¹ but there is nothing in it to suggest that they had ever thought of the Mosaic Law as binding on them. That point had been definitely settled; and the Judaistic tendency had taken another and more subtle direction. The Judaic rules and prohibitions did not appear to the Colossians as imperative commands of God which must be obeyed, but as philosophic principles which appealed to their intellect and reason.

But, if the first Pauline Churches that were attacked had accepted and endorsed the principle that the Mosaic Law was binding on them, their example would have been a serious danger to the neighbouring Phrygian Churches of the Lycus valley, and could hardly have failed to secure at least careful attention for the view which they had accepted.

Finally, to regard this letter as unsuccessful is to despair of Paul. The letter, with its commanding and almost autocratic tone—though I feel and confess that these adjectives are too strong, and ignore the emotion, and sympathy, and love which breathe through the words and take much of the sting from them—is one that could be

¹ Hort, *Romans and Ephesians*, p. 192.

justified only by success. If it failed, then it deserved to fail. No man has any right to use such a tone to other men, unless it is the suitable and best tone for their good; and the issue is the only test whether it was suitable and best. Paul's knowledge of human nature in his converts is staked on the success of the letter.

To put the case shortly: Paul was here engaged in his first great contest on the threshold of the country that he was winning for the Church: it was a test case: had he failed in it, he would never have conquered the Roman world. He was successful; and the back of the Judaistic propaganda was broken.

W. M. RAMSAY.

DOCTRINES OF GRACE.

VII.

GOOD WORKS.

ONE may believe that there is a unity between faith and good works, but one cannot shut his eyes to the fact that throughout Holy Scripture there is an apparent conflict. If the Psalms magnify faith in God with all the resources of their passionate poetry, the same Psalms also declare that no one can have access unto the Eternal unless he keeps the law of God with all his heart and with all his strength. The second Isaiah may represent the Messiah as the sin-bearer upon whom are laid the iniquities of us all, but Isaiah of Jerusalem beseeches his people not to put their trust in sacrifice but to wash their hands and make them clean by all godly living. In the Book of Revelation the saints wash their robes and make them white in the blood of the Lamb, but at the same time none can enter through the gates into the city except those

who have kept the commandments of God. St. Paul devotes all the strength of his inspired reason to show that no man can be saved except through faith, and to hold up Abraham as a type of a believer; but St. James, his fellow apostle and of the same period, insists that a man is not saved by faith, but by works, and uses Abraham as the exemplar of such works. And the Master Himself demands from beginning to end of his public ministry that people should believe, and seems to make everything of faith; and yet it is Jesus who declares that he only who keeps His words has built his house upon a rock, and that in the day of the Great Judgment it is charity that will win the prize. One might take the Bible in his hand and show that salvation is through works, and he also might take the same Bible and show that salvation is through faith, and it is not therefore wonderful that people with a bias either to the practical or the mystical side of religion should entrench themselves in their favourite passages and build up their opposite theories of the religious life.

This is the most reasonable excuse which can be offered for that exasperating and futile, but ever-burning controversy which rages both in literature and in theology as well as in the discussions of private life between the comparative value of a correct creed and of a correct life. It will always be said with a fair amount of justice that one who observes the commandments and lives cleanly, honestly, and kindly with his fellow men must surely have the right of it, and be accepted both by God and man. This position must receive the approval of commonsense and make a strong appeal also to the average conscience because a righteous life is ever to be approved, and is indeed the only visible guarantee of goodness to our fellow men. It will also be urged by other people, more inclined to the theory of things than to the domination of facts, that if one should hold the belief of the Catholic Church regarding

God and Jesus Christ, he will surely be received into the Divine fellowship and be a person acceptable to God, and this position appeals to our respect for authority and to our historic sense. It comes to pass, therefore, that many go out of their way to belittle correct thinking in matters of religion and to speak as if our reason had no function whatever in the sphere of the Divine mystery, and the same persons will insist unto weariness upon the excellence of the practical virtues and the moral type of character. Other persons, again, will have a profound suspicion of ordinary morality, and greatly dislike its enforcement upon the conscience, and they will magnify unto the heavens the spiritual value of holding the Catholic Creed and thinking along the line of past generations. Between those opposite schools and their wordy warfare the ordinary person is often perplexed and almost driven unto despair, inclined one day to trouble himself no more about the doctrines of the Christian faith, but to occupy himself entirely with the Ten Words of Moses, and another day to give himself with all his strength to the study of the Nicene Creed and to leave life to take care of itself.

This confusion would be dispelled, and we would arrive at the truth of things, if we were more careful to understand the meaning of the terms which we use as weapons. Creed and life are tossed to and fro in their shallowest sense, and we are not at the trouble of piercing to that deeper meaning where both meet in perfect harmony. The moment that we grasp their true content, then the controversy is practically at an end, and we find that two words have been put asunder which God has joined together. Of course if one is to define creed as simply the intellectual belief of certain doctrines which have been formed in the Schools, and which are sanctioned by the authority of the Church, then it is plain that salvation upon such a condition would be a non-moral and unspiritual salvation.

Were people to congratulate themselves upon being in a state of grace because they hold the doctrine of the Holy Trinity and cry anathema upon those who deny it, then their faith would be a disaster to their souls, and their religion would be of none effect. And if any person should take life at its lowest reading and count godly living to be nothing else than the punctilious and ostentatious discharge of certain obvious duties, then he would be most easily satisfied in religion and would simply be a somewhat shallow type of Pharisee. Such a creed could save no man because it has no ethical force, while it might make a man hard and bitter, contemptuous and persecuting: such a life could save no man because it would have no spiritual value, while it might make a man shallow and self-righteous and egotistical and vain. This creed receives no sanction anywhere in Holy Scripture, while it is at least once dismissed with contempt—"The devils believe and tremble": this life was estimated at its proper value by Jesus Himself when He exposed the poor make-believe of the scribes and Pharisees.

The faith which is magnified in the Bible, and which is dear unto the saint, is no tepid belief, but a passionate conviction. It has really nothing to do with doctrines save in so far as they are the expression of religious experiences: it has to do from beginning to end with God revealed in Jesus Christ our Lord. It is the conviction that God is our Father, and has loved us from eternity, that Christ is the Saviour of the human soul and has laid down His life for us sinners. It is the conviction that Christ is able to deliver a man from his sins and to re-create him in the image of God. But it is, above all, the surrender of a man's whole being into the hands of Christ and a loyal purpose of obedience unto Christ's commandments. It is not the faith which argues and speculates, it is the faith which repents and strives, which longs and loves. It is the

faith which places a man under the dominion of the Spirit of God and under the sign of Christ's Cross.

Faith in this sense—the passion of a man's whole nature—instead of being a mere ghost of the study, is the strongest principle in human life. Behind every brave endeavour and behind every lasting achievement lies faith; for the men who dared these things and the men who brought them to perfection have first of all been brave believers. Abraham, when he went out from his own land and made the chief departure in human history, and also Columbus, when he left the Old World in search of the New, both went out in faith. The apostles, when they established a new kingdom amid the ruins of the decadent Roman Empire, and every reformer that has broken the shackles of slavery and led men into the land of promise, alike have walked by faith. No one in his home and no one in private life ever made a sacrifice with pain to himself or ever rendered service with good to his neighbour, but was inspired and moved by faith. They that have not faith, and regard only the things which are seen, are cowards and selfish. They that behold the things which are not seen are strong and self-denying, so that the great periods of history have been periods of faith, and the ignoble periods have been periods when faith was dead.

As it is faith which gives a man vision, the believer is therefore lifted above a squalid and ignoble life, and is able to endure labour and sorrow with patience and magnanimity. It was because Moses saw Him who was invisible that he despised the material civilization of Egypt and threw in his lot with the children of Israel, and by the same faith that he endured their gainsaying and obstinacy; by faith the prophets escaped the low and ensnaring ideals of their own time and reached forward to the glory of the Messianic kingdom. Faith strengthened the apostles of Jesus, so that they were not overcome either by the glory

of Greece or by the grandeur of Rome, but were firmly persuaded that the chief kingdom on earth was righteousness, peace, and joy. Just as a man who sees noble things, and has associated with noble people, lives himself after the same fashion—a civilized man among savages, a cultured man among Philistines—so the religious man who associates with the Master regards with indifference the tawdry glitter of this world, and bears the trials of the present life with an even mind. And so faith produces the best of all works, a pure heart and a calm life.

History affords illustrations upon the largest and most convincing scale of the omnipotence of faith. If only a strong man can believe in any cause with all his mind and with all his heart, he makes converts to the cause by the hundred thousand, and will carry that cause to victory. No danger daunts faith, no argument turns aside its onslaught. The believer is a force, he is a partaker of the Divine strength, he fights along with the angels of God. Mahomet and his early followers created a religion and conquered provinces of the human race because they believed, and more than once a handful of men have changed the fortunes of an empire because they were strong in faith. Faith is the nurse of unworldly aspiration, and of splendid deeds which have redeemed the race from reproach and made its history to be an inspiration.

It ought, therefore, surely to be evident that if faith on the ordinary level of life is capable of splendid achievement, there can be no limit to her fruitfulness in the sphere of the Christian religion. Faith here is devotion, not to an imperfect man or to a doubtful cause, but to the Son of God, "Immortal Love," to Him who is the perfect ideal of the human soul, who is also the spring and fulness of spiritual life. When one believes with all his soul in Jesus, what sacrifices may not be accomplished! what services may he not render! what mercy will be in his soul! what charity

will be visible in his life! His will be no mere deeds of ordinary morality—such poor efforts can be accomplished without faith; his will be the rich and delicate fruit of the Spirit—the lessons which can only be learned at the feet of Jesus Christ. A new principle of life in his soul will appear in acts of which, in their spirituality and in their graciousness, morality never dreams and which have only been revealed and made possible by the life of Jesus Himself. Through the soul grafted into the stock of Christ the very sap of the Divine Spirit will flow, and the flowers will be after the fashion of the Gospels in their heavenly colour and richness. Without the faith of Christ these works had not been possible, and the works and faith are related together as the tree and the fruit. They are good works because they are the fruit of faith, and faith has been vindicated by the works which it has produced.

It may, of course, be urged that many good works have been produced without the principle of faith, and that it is not just to condemn the works which have not sprung from faith; and certainly the advocate of faith should be very careful, in his zeal for faith, that he do no despite to morality. It ought to be freely granted that many persons who are, at least, not consciously in the communion of Jesus' spirit, and not a few who are absolute unbelievers, have led lives of elevation and nobility. These lonely and cheerless lives, whereon the sun has shined so coldly and yet which have produced pure Alpine flowers, are a rebuke unto persons who have lived in perpetual warmth, and whose souls ought to have abounded in flower and fruit. No one ought ever to plead for faith apart from works, nor ought he at any time to belittle the fruits of morality. The strength of faith is ever to be tested by the abundance of works, and he who produces no works has no faith. If there be such a thing as dead works—works, that is to

say, without beauty and without fragrance—there is such a thing as dead faith, faith without force and without love.

While, however, the possibility of certain works apart from faith must be allowed, it must also be insisted that the quality of works without faith can never be compared with the quality of the works which spring from faith. This is really not a matter of theology but of human experience, and it turns upon the character of a man's work. Work is not to be measured by time and by quantity, by its appearance and its effect; it is ever to be estimated by its spirit. It is not the drawing and the colouring which constitute the fascination of a picture, it is the mind of the artist. It is not the form and show of a deed which constitutes its excellence, it is the intention of the doer. What a man is passes into his work, and the principle of faith, which, as we were saying, is fellowship with Jesus Christ, tinges all the works which are done by the man's Christ-nature, and lends unto them some of the beauty of the Lord's own life. Every day we have regard to the spirit of work, distinguishing between good works which live and bad works which are already dead. The present bestowed upon one by a person who does not love him, and has only given for selfish purposes, is a poor thing, which earns no gratitude and is thrown aside with dislike. The gift offered unto one by his child, who has denied himself in order to obtain it and bestows it for affection's sake, is precious beyond silver and gold, and is treasured with vigilant care. It matters nothing that the former offering was costly and shapely, or that the latter was of little value and uncomely to the eye; each is really a symbol—one for a strange and cold heart, the other for tender and humble affection. We therefore conclude in the affairs of life that there are two kinds of works, living and dead, and that the difference is the spirit which planned and performed them.

Are we, therefore, unreasonable in holding that in the religious life works also fall into two classes, with a different value before God and even before man? Was it the same thing that a Pharisee should tithe his mint and his anise and his cummin, and that a poor widow should throw two mites into the treasury? Did not the honest heart of the people distinguish between the two? and is not God greater than our hearts and knoweth all things? Was it the same thing that Simon the Pharisee asked Jesus to a feast for custom's sake, if not for meaner reasons, and that Matthew the publican also asked Him to a feast for love's sake and in the gratitude of his soul? Is it the same thing that a man should obey the demands of the moral law for the sake of his reputation, and the opinion of his neighbour, and the comfort of his life, and the obtaining of glory, and that he should keep the same law, not in the letter but in the spirit, with an overflowing measure of obedience because it is the law of his Heavenly Father and the commandment of his Saviour? Is there anything less attractive and less effectual for high ends than cold and calculated morality? Is there anything more winsome and inspiring than self-forgetful and self-sacrificing devotion?

When Christianity makes works to be dependent upon faith and its constant outcome, our religion not only delivers its disciples from the tyranny of legal bondage, but also affords the most certain guarantee of high living. If the Christian seems to leave Moses and the Ten Words, it is to find the Ten Words deepened and spiritualized in the Sermon on the Mount, and to discover in Jesus not only a Lawgiver, but also an Exemplar. If the motive of fear be relaxed and disappear, then the Christian is not left without a salutary stimulus, for love takes the place of fear, and he obeys because he loves, till perfect love casts out fear. If for the moment he suffers no longer the scourge of an angry conscience, he is strengthened inwardly into obedience by

the Spirit of his Lord. Good works are no longer now a task and a performance—they are a devotion and a fruit. He is not a servant fulfilling his appointed tale of work, he is a child doing his father's will in his father's house. Good works in all their forms are now the expression of his gratitude, and the harvest of his believing soul.

By this doctrine of faith and good works two persons are condemned, and the first is the man who professes to afford works, but confesses that he has no faith. Upon the whole he is apt to be high and lifted up, congratulating himself upon his strength and upon his independence, who has been able to do all these things without Jesus Christ. The measure of his moral success is in reality the reflection upon his unbelief. He has been careful to pay all the debts which he owed to trifling creditors; he ignores and refuses to pay his debts to his chief Creditor, who is God. He gives himself some trouble to show respect to his fellow men according to the claims which they have upon him of honour or of charity; but one Man he selects for rejection and indignity, and that is the Man who laid down His life upon the cross that he might be saved. He takes credit to himself because no good cause has ever appealed in vain to him, and no high ideal has ever been unadmired by his soul, and yet it is this very man who passes by the invitation of God's kingdom, and will have none of the cross of Christ. What value in character shall we assign to the soul which admires all spiritual beauty except the beauty of Christ, which gives welcome to all love except the perfect love of God, which is ready to do every good work except the chief work of all, and that is faith in Christ?

The other person condemned by this doctrine is he who professes to believe, and who knows that he is not doing the works. Could there be any more ghastly irony than a human being declaring his faith in God and refusing

to keep His laws; calling himself by the name of Christ, and denying Christ's cross; accepting his fellow men as his brethren in Christ, and not doing them even a stranger's service? How can he have learned to call God Father, whom he has never seen, when he does not treat his fellow man as a brother, whom he has seen? How can his sins have been forgiven of God—sins which were as scarlet and red like crimson—when he will not forgive his neighbour the trifling transgressions of human life? how can he be partaker of the Divine grace, whose poverty-stricken soul is not bearing the scanty fruits of common morality? Can it be in the reason of things that an ungrateful, unloving, dishonest and unrighteous person is saved? And when we ask the question, it answers itself: Without works there is no faith; and this man is walking in a vain show, and feeding his soul with wind. His exposure in some moral crisis of life, when, forsaken of the grace which he has abused, he falls into gross sin, or when, in the light of eternity, his refuges of lies and coverings of hypocrisy will be burned up, is going to be one of the most awful acts of Divine judgment.

JOHN WATSON.

APOCALYPTIC SKETCHES.

VIII.

THE SCARLET WOMAN AND HER FATE.

REV. XVII., XVIII.

WE were told that in the seven vials "is finished the wrath of God" (xv. 1). What then have we here? Clearly not anything apart from the vials, but something involved in them, as indeed is made quite evident by the fact that the invitation to behold is from one of the seven angels of the vials. His function is to call attention to one great result

of the outpouring of the vials, the downfall of Babylon. In the 17th chapter we have the symbolic representation of Babylon ; in the 18th we have a dirge over her fall.

The symbolic representation is complex, a woman seated upon a scarlet-coloured beast. The woman is clearly a contrast to the woman of chapter xii., and a very striking contrast it is ! The woman of chapter xii. was a representation of the ideal Church, her seat in heaven, her raiment the light, the great features which impress you being heavenliness, simplicity, purity, glory. The woman of chapter xvii. is the antipodes of all this ; she is " of the earth earthy " ; she is " arrayed in purple and scarlet, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls." In her hand there is a golden cup, and see what is in it (v. 4), and observe the name written on her forehead (v. 5), though from the very sight of her you know her character even if it were not so plainly told. Clearly the Sun-clad Woman and the Scarlet Woman are in strictest contrast ; the one is to be thought of as over against the other. This leads to the conclusion that as the Sun-clad Woman represents the ideal Church, the Church, in so far as she is faithful to her Lord, the Scarlet Woman represents the antithesis of this, the Church not faithful to her Lord, as allowing herself to be seduced by the wiles of the world ; and this is confirmed by the leading word in the inscription, " Mystery," a word which is suggestive of sacred rather than civil associations. And here some think of the apostate Jewish Church, others of the Pagan worship of the emperors, still others of the apostate Church of Rome. But is it necessary to tie down the reference to any one period ? On the principles on which our exposition has proceeded, we might well suppose that the apostate Jewish Church came first into the seer's mind, but that the apostate Christians of the time would be in the very same condemnation ; and as for the Church of Rome, its

applicability is only too obvious in much of her history ; but to tie it down to the Church of Rome and say that it only is referred to, is not only to violate sound principles of interpretation but to pass condemnation on a particular Church more sweeping than is warranted by facts.

That the Church of Rome has acted as much in the spirit of the Scarlet Woman as any Church in history is no doubt true enough, but to say that she has shown no other spirit is to state what is not true. The fact is, we have in the two women a sharp contrast in the ideal, which never finds, either on the one side or on the other, full realization in history. What Church in all Christendom could claim to stand out in history as the realization of the symbol of the 12th chapter: "A woman arrayed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars"? Shall I claim it for the Presbyterian Church? Verily no: I may think it comes as near as any other, but that would surely be the very farthest any one will go. Is there any one dare claim it for the Anglican Church, after the iniquities which were perpetrated by her in the old days of cruel persecution? On the other hand, who will say that the worst of the Churches has been wholly bad, has stood out in history, age after age, as the representative of this frightful woman on the scarlet-coloured beast? No, no. There is the impressive contrast before us of light and darkness, the one applying to the faithful and true, the other applying to the faithless and false ; but the contrast, when presented in its sharpness, as it is in these opposing symbols, is purely ideal. In actual life light and darkness are mingled, and every Church is of the nature of the Sun-clad Woman, so far as she walks in light, and of the nature of the Scarlet Woman so far as she walks in darkness, and especially so far as she makes herself partaker of the sin which is above all symbolized in the scarlet colour: "I saw the woman drunken with the

blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." And it is, no doubt, because the Church of Rome has been guilty above all others of this terrible iniquity that it was so universally assumed among students of the new-found Scriptures at the time of the Reformation that the Scarlet Woman could be none other than the cruel, persecuting Church of Rome. Their interpretation was correct so far: what was wrong was in restricting the application to one particular Church.

But we have to think of the beast as well as of the woman. And here there is no difficulty except in matters of detail. Clearly the beast on which the woman sits is the world power by which she practises her cruelties, represented at the time, of course, by the world-wide Roman Empire. It is clearly the same beast as in chapter xiii., with only such new features in description as are specially suited to the surroundings. We need not then dwell on the old features, but only look at some of the new ones.

The most striking part, perhaps, is the 8th verse, which seems a travesty of the great words of Christ Himself in the first chapter. Recall the travesty of the name Michael in the 13th chapter. We found, when we were studying that portion, that Michael is a title of Christ Himself, the meaning of it being: "Who is like unto God?" Presently comes the mocking blasphemy from below, "Who is like unto the beast?" a travesty of the great name Michael. In the same way, just as Christ had said in the opening of the Apocalypse: "I am the Alpha and the Omega, saith the Lord God, which is and which was and which is to come"; and again, "I am the first and the last, and the Living One; and I was dead, and, behold, I am alive for evermore"; so now we have, as it were, a fearful contrast which is at the same time something of a counterpart: "The beast that thou sawest was, and is not; and is about to come up out of the abyss, and to go into perdition."

There is an obvious parallel between the two utterances, and at the same time a most striking contrast. And see how it is dwelt on ; and how it puzzles those who have no true knowledge of Christ: "And they that dwell on the earth shall wonder (whose names were not written in the Book of Life from the foundation of the world) when they behold the beast that was, and is not, and yet is."

Now what does it all mean? The interpretation is given in what follows, though unhappily it is not so clear to us as to afford the certainty one would wish. The interpretation which seems most natural is that which makes the seven kings impersonations, as in Daniel (see Dan. vii., especially v. 23) of so many kingdoms. Then the sequence would be Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome. So Rome comes in as the sixth. This agrees with what is said in verse 10, "Five are fallen, and one is." The seventh will come in the days of the ten horns, when the Roman Empire shall be broken up: "Five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come."

But so far we have not seen anything in the history of the beast to be thought of as a travesty of the death and resurrection of Christ. Those who take the kings not as successive kingdoms, but as successive emperors of Rome, refer to the common belief of the time that Nero would rise again from the dead with new power and prestige. But if we adhere to the interpretation of the successive kingdoms, then the reference would be to the great victory which Christ gained over the Prince of the World by His cross,¹ by which he was supposed to be driven into the abyss ; but, behold, he has emerged, he is raging again with resistless force ; if Christ, as you Christians say, has risen from the dead and has all power in heaven, then His great antagonist, the Prince of this World, has risen from the

¹ "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out" (John xii. 31).

pit of the abyss into which you suppose he had been cast, and has all power on earth: "The beast that thou sawest was, and is not, and is about to come up out of the abyss"—not indeed to live and reign for ever, but "to go into perdition."

It is evident that there is uncertainty as to these details of exposition; but the broad facts surely are clear enough that the woman, if you distinguish her from the beast on which she rides, means the apostate Church; and the beast, when you separate it from the woman who rides upon it, means the world power in its ferocity and cruelty, as represented at the time by the Roman Empire.

Observe, however, that the seer does not so sharply distinguish between the woman and the beast. He regards them as one, and takes them both together as symbolic of Babylon the Great. And surely from the whole description this cannot mean anything else than Rome. I know that a good deal can be said in favour of Jerusalem; but this is only by treating the woman apart from the beast on which she rides, which the language of the seer seems scarcely to allow; and surely the reference to "peoples and multitudes and nations and tongues" suggests the empire city rather than the provincial capital; and though the expression "the great city" might in itself be applied, and indeed in chapter xi. 8 is applied, to Jerusalem, the fact that it is spoken of as "reigning over the kings of the earth" (xvii. 18) seems to settle the question. Moreover, when we come to the dirge, we shall find it expressed in language which would surely seem exaggeration as applied to any other city than the great metropolis of the world.

The chapter is mainly taken up with a development of the symbolic figure of the woman and the beast; but there is a passing reference to the conflict in which the enemy, apparently so irresistible, is overthrown, not by another beast more ferocious or another woman more seductive, but

by the Lamb, the most gentle and guileless of all creatures. So far as worldly force is concerned, it is a helpless lamb against a terrific monster, the one supported by a little band of simple faithful men and women and little children, the other backed by all the might of invincible legions and all the resources of all the kings of the earth over which the city reigns, the whole forces of the world being of one mind, and giving their power and authority unto the beast (v. 13). "These shall war against the Lamb"; and, of course, the resistance of such a feeble creature will be vain? Nay, verily, "And the Lamb shall overcome them." Why? The reason is found in the heavenly sphere beyond the range alike of the woman and the beast. "For He is Lord of lords and King of kings, and they also shall overcome that are with Him, called and chosen and faithful" (v. 14).

What a splendid expression of exultant faith! And still more remarkable in this respect is the marvellous dirge of chapter xviii. Remember what Rome was. We think of London as the modern Babylon, and so it is in respect of its size and wealth and luxury; but in relative greatness it is not to compare with the old Rome; we should need to combine with it Berlin and Vienna and the modern Rome and Paris and New York, in order to get a true conception of the relative might of that city which did not form one of a "concert of powers," but which "reigned over the kings of the earth." Look at that symbol of the waters representing the peoples and multitudes and nations and tongues (v. 15), and remember that the beast emerged from the sea. That was how Rome presented itself to the eye of the seer's imagination, as a resistless world power raging like a furious beast invested with the omnipotence of the sea. With the eye of faith he sees it "fallen, fallen, fallen," and with the ear of faith he hears the lament over its fall of princes and merchants and all that go down to the sea in

ships. Oh, yes, he heard the raging of the cruel sea ; but above it all he heard the boom of the 93rd Psalm : " Thy throne is established of old ; Thou art from everlasting. The floods have lifted up, O Lord, the floods have lifted up their voice ; the floods lift up their waves. The Lord on high is mightier than the noise of many waters, yea, than the mighty waves of the sea."

And now the dirge of chapter xviii. is so simple that no exposition is necessary. It is enough to read it, and, as we read, to observe that there is throughout it, except where the sin of the city is spoken of, a touching note of sympathy. It is not mere exultation over a fallen foe. Like Ezekiel's lament over Tyre, there is no contempt of that magnificence which was not evil in itself, but was made evil by its association with unbelief and sin ; so it is a genuine dirge, as of one mourning over a fallen antagonist who deserves to be spoken of, apart from the one great subject of quarrel, in terms of admiration and respect. The whole chapter is one of the most powerful and impressive in the Bible and in all literature.

It is not possible to read this chapter without thinking of London, in the midst of whose wealth and luxury and extravagance our lot is cast. Let not any one imagine that the Scarlet Woman is at as safe a distance as Rome. She is here. And her wiles and blandishments meet us every day. Let us see, then, that we be not seduced from our allegiance to Christ, but that we be found among the followers of the Lamb who are " called and chosen and faithful " ; and in order to this let us make sure that we find our treasure and delight not in the purple and the scarlet, the gold and the precious stones and pearls of Babylon the Great, but in the light and purity of the Spouse of God, in the righteousness and peace and joy of the Kingdom of Heaven.

J. MONRO GIBSON.

GEOGRAPHICAL GAINS FROM TEXTUAL CRITICISM.

AN extremely interesting but obscure description of the route of an Assyrian invader of South Palestine is given in Isaiah x. 27(end)-32. By whom it was written is not known with any certainty. The plays on the place-names remind us of Micah i. 10-16, the textual difficulties of which I have already sought to mitigate.¹ I venture to attempt a restoration of the text of the passage in Isaiah.²

בָּא עַל-עֵיִת	עֲלֶה מִפֵּץ מִצְפּוֹן ¹
לְמִכְמָשׁ יַפְקִיד בְּדָיו	עָבַר בְּמִגְרוֹן ²
גָּבַע מָלוֹן לָכֹו	עָבְרוּ מִעֶבְרָה ³
גָּבַעַת שָׁאוּל נָסָה	חָרְדָה הָרָמָה ⁴
הִקְשִׁיבִי אֶלְעָשָׂה	צִהְלִי קוֹלְךָ בֵּית-גִּלְגָּל ⁵
עָנִית עֲנֹתוֹת	* * * *
יִשְׁבִּי בַּהֲרִים הָעִזִּיו	נָדְדָה רַפְנָה ⁷
יִנְפֹךְ יָדוֹ	יַעֲמִיד בְּגִבְעַת אֱלֹהִים ⁸

¹ The Hammer comes up from the north : he falls upon Aiath ;

² He passes through Migron ; at Michmash he lays up his baggage ;

³ They go through the pass ; Geba is their place of bivouac ;

⁴ Ramah is terror-stricken ; Saul's Gibeah flees.

⁵ Shriek, O Beth-gilgal ; listen, O Elasah :

⁶ * - * * * ; thou art humbled, O Anathoth.

¹ *Jewish Quarterly Review*, x. [July, 1898], pp. 565 ff.

² Without adequate notes (from want of space) it will be given in the Addenda to the Hebrew edition of Isaiah in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*.

⁷ Rimmonah takes to flight ; the inhabitants of Bahurim gather their goods to flee.

⁸ He halts on the sacred Gibeah, shaking his (clenched) fist.

Line 1a. Robertson Smith in 1885 proposed עֲלָה מִצָּפוֹן שֶׁרָר, "the Destroyer comes up from the north" (*Journal of Philology*, xiii. 62 ff.). The material provided by the Massoretic text is מִפְּנֵי שָׁנָי. Either of these words might be a corrupt fragment of מִצָּפוֹן. But the metre requires three words, and it is open to us to conjecture that נֵי comes out of an illegible נִי. Nebuchadnezzar is called the hammer of the nations in Jeremiah li. 20 ; cf. also Nahum ii. 2 [1], where perhaps מִכִּיץ (A.V. "he that dasheth in pieces") should be מִכֶּיץ, "a hammer." Aiath is probably the same as Ai, which was near the modern Dêr Divân, but where, is uncertain (Bädeker's *Palestine*, ed. 2, p. 119). From Bethel to Dêr Divân is a straight road.

Line 2. Migron seems to correspond to the ruins at Makrun, north of Michmash, on the road to Ai. Those who go from Michmash to Bethel "ascend towards the north to the table-land along the east side of a narrow but deep valley which runs into the Wady Suweiniṭ. At the point where we obtain a view of the valley there are several rock-tombs on the west slope, above which lies the ruins of Makrûn, the ancient Migron (Isa. x. 28)." So Bädeker, *i.e.* the late Prof. Socin, who edited the book.

Line 3. The pass is no doubt the deep defile of the Wady Suweiniṭ. Geba is the modern Jeba', which commands the pass of Michmash. For לָנוּ, "to us," we should read לָמֶי, "to them"—an easy change.

Line 4. Ramah is er-Râm ; Saul's Gibeah Tell el-Fûl, a fine conical hill with an extensive view, four miles north of Jerusalem.

Line 5a. The text gives בֵּית-עַמִּים, "O community of

Gallim." Gallim can only mean "heaps" (of stones); the sense "springs" could only be justified by Canticles iv. 12, where, however, גַּל should be גֶּן, "garden" (so Budde). Considering, however, that a place called Beth-gilgal is mentioned in Nehemiah xii. 29, in connection with Geba and Azmaveth, and a place called Geliloth, and also Gilgal, on the border between Benjamin and Judah (Josh. xviii. 17; xv. 7), it is reasonable to suppose that some circle of prehistoric stones is meant, near which a village or town had sprung up, and to assume Geliloth, or, better, (Beth) Gilgal to be the name written by the prophet. Either name would be more distinct and distinctive than the common reading Gallim, "heaps." Probably the prophet or poet means the place which is called Beth-gilgal in Nehemiah, and Geliloth "which fronts the ascent of Adummim" (*i.e.* the *Tel'at ed-dam*, which rises above the khân of the Good Samaritan on the way to Jericho), in Joshua xviii. 17.

Line 5*b*. לִישָׁה (E.V. Laishah) is presumably the same as לַיִשׁ (Laish); cf. 1 Samuel xxv. 44, and 2 Samuel iii. 15. No such place-name, however, as Laish is known in Benjamin, and no such personal name as Laish occurs anywhere, except in the two passages referred to; it is, on the whole, probable that in both Samuel and Isaiah לַיִשׁ, or לִישָׁה, is a corruption of אֱלֹהֵשָׁה (God has made), and that in Isaiah reference is made, not to the Eleasa of 1 Maccabees ix. 5 (represented by the modern Il'asâ), but to the spot represented by the village *el-'Isâwiyeh*, towards Anathoth (which Bâdeker, p. 117, wrongly identifies with Nob). This is new, but, I believe, true. For the personal name Elasah, see 1 Chronicles ii. 39 f., viii. 37, ix. 43; Ezra x. 22; Jeremiah xxix. 3.

Line 6. The עֲנִיָּה of the text can hardly be right. We may either read עֲנִיָּה (Pesh., Lowth, Ewald, Cheyne [formerly], Duhm, etc.), or (since half a line seems to

have fallen out) read עֲנִית, as proposed here, or with Grätz we may read עֲנִיָּה, which is the name of a place in Benjamin, Nehemiah xi. 32.

Line 7. מַדְמֵנָה (Madmenah) should mean "dung-heap"—a most improbable name, even after we have duly assimilated the fact that heaps of very mixed origin are to be seen at the entrance to Arab villages (see Delitzsch, *Job*, pp. 62 f.). Almost certainly we should read רַמְנָה; compare רַמְנָה, Joshua xxi. 35, on which Dillmann remarks that we should probably read רַמְנָה (see 1 Chron. vi. 62). All similar names, such as Madmen (Jer. xlviii. 2, from נִמְרִים, Nimrim), Madmannah, are beyond reasonable doubt corrupt. The Rimmonah meant was not "the rock Rimmon" of Judges xx. 45, but nearer to Jerusalem. There were doubtless not a few places in Palestine called Rimmon, or Rimmonah. הַגְּבִים, "the trenches," is also an improbable name. Read בְּחָרִים, Bahurim, which was most probably not the same as Almon (now *Almî*), as most moderns have held, in deference to the Targum, but near Jerusalem on the old road to Jericho (see Buhl, *Geographie*, p. 176; Grove, *Smith's Dict. of the Bible*, ed. i., 162a). ה and ג, ר and ה are liable to confusion; transposition accounts for the rest of the process by which בְּחָרִים has become הַגְּבִים.

Line 8 is largely made up of corrupt dittograms and glosses. עֹד is a fragment of יַעֲמֹד. לַעֲמֹד is a corruption of a dittographed יַעֲמֹד. בְּנֵב is a corrupt fragment of בְּגִבְעַת אֶלֶּהִים יְרוּשָׁלַם. An over-wise scribe inferred from the context that mount Zion must be meant, though the phrase גִּבְעַת יְרוּשָׁה, "hill of Jerusalem," nowhere else occurs. בֵּית-צִיּוֹן in בֵּית is a corrupt fragment of גִּבְעַת. Later students conjectured בֵּית, and attached צִיּוֹן to it, thus producing the familiar phrase "the daughter (= people) of Zion"; to this phrase הָר was prefixed to clear up the meaning of the unfamiliar

(corrupt) phrase, "the hill of Jerusalem." היום still remains unaccounted for. It is a corrupt fragment of אלהים. It is a curious collection of errors, to which, however, there are many parallels, especially in the Psalter.

Probably the above re-examination of a much-debated passage will further illustrate the criticism which experience forced from me, and not any captiousness towards Prof. H. P. Smith, on the remark that conjectural emendation "should not be put in the same class with emendation on the basis of evidence, even the evidence of a version." A conjectural emendation may, at any rate in many cases, have better evidence than an emendation based on a version. Conjectural emendation is an art which requires to be slowly and painfully learned, like any other art; and I think that experience shows that conjectural emendation based on evidence can remove not a few serious difficulties which have hindered the due appreciation of some parts of the literary records of revelation.

T. K. CHEYNE.

MOSES, THE ANGELIC MEDIATOR.

THE little verse, Galatians iii. 20, "Now a mediator is not a mediator of one; but God is one," as given in A.V. and R.V., has the distinction of being one of the most obscure and difficult of interpretation in the whole Bible. The number of different explanations of it extant has been reckoned by different commentators at 250, 300, 450 and even a still higher figure, and it has been said, indeed, that the verse requires a bibliography for itself. It may seem rather presumptuous under such circumstances to propound another explanation of the text, yet this is what I venture to do. The verse forms the keystone of an important argument of St. Paul, and we cannot therefore be content to allow it to remain in its present obscurity. There is no suspicion of corruption in the text. There can be no doubt that the Apostle not only had a meaning in the words he used, but wished to convey that meaning clearly and convincingly to those whom he was addressing. Now the sense of the verse as expressed in the translations of both A.V. and R.V. is so difficult to comprehend that after between four and five hundred "explanations" it still remains as enigmatical as ever.

Up to a certain point the drift of the Apostle's argument is clear enough. He is showing the superiority of the Promise of Faith made to Abraham to the Law διαταγὰς δι' ἀγγέλων, ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου (viz. Moses). But at this point, according to our versions, both A.V. and R.V. and the great mass of commentators, he lays down a general proposition relating to the *functions* of a mediator. "A mediator is not of one," *i.e.* according to the universal explanation, a mediator implies two parties at least. So far as the term "mediator" is concerned the argument assumes this form:—

A mediator is not of one:

God is one. . . .

Therefore? . . . But the puzzle is, *what* is the inference to be deduced?

The object of this paper is not to attempt to summarize the opinions of even the stars of Biblical exegesis on this subject, but rather to state the views which a careful study of the context in the original and of the chief collateral passages in the New Testament have suggested to the writer, and to ask for these views, however novel in some respects they may seem, fair consideration at the hands of Biblical scholars.

It will hardly, I presume, be denied that St. Paul is here developing an argument which he first heard used by Stephen. The speech in which that argument occurs was made under circumstances calculated deeply to impress even ordinary listeners.

O! but they say the tongues of dying men
Enforce attention like deep harmony ;

but on the memory of Saul, bitterly conscious of his guilty complicity in the martyr's death, we may be sure every word would be indelibly branded. That death-speech of Stephen was St. Paul's first lesson in Gospel theology. We may therefore confidently assume that whatever views were there set forth as to the way in which the Law was given to the Jews, and the relative importance of the Law and the Promise in God's dealings with man would be fully accepted by St. Paul, and would govern his own teaching on the same subjects.

That St. Paul's very words in Galatians iii. 19 were an echo of Stephen's speech is of course obvious. The phrase *διαταγὰς δι' ἀγγέλων* is an almost verbal reproduction of Stephen's *οἵτινες ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων*.

Moses is conspicuous alike in the argument of Stephen and Paul, and, in both arguments, his connection with angels in the giving of the Law is much insisted on. In

the word "Angels," if the view here advocated be correct, will be found the key to this difficult passage.

Alford, in his remarks on Galatians iii. 18, 19, and 20, says that clearly (1) ὁ μεσίτης and ὁ θεός are opposed, and that (2) ἐνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν and εἰς ἐστίν are also opposed; but if we look carefully at the passage, we shall, I think, see that there is an opposition intended between θεός and the ἄγγελοι referred to. τῷ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ δι' ἐπαγγελίας κεχάρισται ὁ θεός (v. 18), but the Law on the other hand is said to have been διαταγείς, and that not *directly* by the Supreme God, but through inferior beings, δι' ἀγγέλων.

Paul argues thus. The Promise is superior to the Law, because made *directly* by God. The Law, on the other hand, was "ordered through the medium of angels" (Page), "ordained through angels by the hand of a mediator" (R.V.) Even in the words διαταγείς and κεχάρισται there is implied a contrast unfavourable to the Law; for the word διαταγείς suggests an austerity of command which is absent from κεχάρισται, which signifies rather a gracious and gratuitous bestowal.

This view, which represents Moses as only the indirect medium of God's delivery of the Law, is somewhat startling to us, accustomed as we are to understand various passages of the O.T. as repeatedly speaking of God as dealing *directly* with Moses in the matter. However, it seems evident that it is this view which is taken by Stephen, and by the Apostle following him. To avoid anthropomorphism, Jewish theologians assumed that in all places where God is spoken of as exhibiting Himself in human semblance, or as having used human speech, He in reality acted or spoke through angelic or human intermediaries. This principle was evidently accepted by Stephen. In Acts vii. 35 he speaks of Moses as having been "sent as a deliverer," not directly by God as *we* should suppose from what seems to us as the natural meaning of Exodus iii.

passim, but as an angelic mediator, "by the hand of the angel which appeared to him in the bush." In like manner, according to Stephen, the Law was not given directly by God to Moses, but in this case also he was but an angelic mediator (Acts vii. 38). "This is he that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake unto him in Mount Sinai, and with our fathers who received living oracles to give unto us" (R.V.).

Strange as this notion of angelic intervention between God and Moses in the giving of the Law appears to us, it finds support, *e.g.*, in such passages of Scripture as Deuteronomy xxxiii. 2 foll. (R.V.).

The Lord came from Sinai.

And rose from Seir unto them.

He shined forth from Paran.

And He came from the ten thousands of holy ones.

At His right hand was a fiery law unto them.

Although in Acts vii. 38 Stephen only refers to *one* angel as having been the medium through whom the Law was conveyed to Moses, yet it is evident from *v.* 53 that he regarded this angel as being the chief of "ten thousand of Holy Ones" then attendant on Jehovah, for he now uses the *plural* number *εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων*. We shall see later on that St. Paul takes advantage, for the purpose of his argument, of the use of the plural number here by Stephen.

That angels were the enactors of the Law was, as is well known, the Rabbinical view (see the quotations given *in loco* by Alford, Ellicott, Lightfoot, etc.), and it was the view held, as appears from the passages quoted, by Stephen also. It follows therefore from this view (and this is clearly the argument which St. Paul is urging in the third chapter of this Epistle), that Moses was not, in the giving of the Law, the mediator between God and man, but only between angels and man. He was therefore, so to speak, not a Divine but only an angelic mediator.

The contrast then between the Dispensation of Angels as presented by the Law, and the Dispensation of Promise as presented by the Gospel, is vital to the Apostle's argument, and the phrase *διαταγείς κ.τ.λ.* is not to be regarded as a mere passing reminiscence of Stephen's *εἰς διαταγὰς τῶν ἀγγέλων*, but *necessary* to the line of reasoning which St. Paul is here pursuing.

If further confirmation of this view be required, we find it in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which, whatever opinion be held as to its authorship, expresses, as is generally admitted, the main features of St. Paul's teaching. There we find the course of argument pursued, the phrases employed in many cases identical with those adopted in the Epistle to the Galatians.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews we see that the author's object, just as in the Epistle to the Galatians, is to show the superiority of the gospel to the legal dispensation by proving that the latter was promulgated through the instrumentality of angels and by an angelic mediator, Moses, while the former was proclaimed by God through His Son (*One* with the Father), who was thus the "Mediator of a better covenant, which hath been enacted upon better promises" (Heb. viii. 6, R.V.).

In the three chief places in the New Testament in which the promise and the law are contrasted, viz., the speech of Stephen, Galatians iii. *passim*, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, the argument is made to turn on the word *ἄγγελοι*. That the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews was saturated with the Jewish theory of angelic ministration which figures so conspicuously in Stephen's speech is sufficiently obvious. Indeed, he evidently has that speech in his mind through the whole course of his argument. His *ὁ δὲ ἄγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος* (Heb. ii. 2) bears manifest reference to Stephen's words in Acts vii. 38, *μετὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σίνα κ.τ.λ.* Indeed,

the word ἄγγελοι in that Epistle is repeated almost *usque ad satietatem*, occurring eleven times in the first two chapters.

But though the course of St. Paul's argument so far may be tolerably clear, there are serious difficulties yet to come. What is the meaning of ὁ μεσίτης in verse 20? How are ἐνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν and εἰς ἔστιν to be interpreted?

Space will not allow me to do much more than give that explanation of the verse which I myself venture to propose. Both A.V. and R.V. translate ὁ μεσίτης as if the article were generic. "Now *a* mediator is not of one; but God is one." Bishop Ellicott, *in loco*, says, "In the first part of the verse all are agreed; 'now *every* mediator involves the idea of more than one.'"

Against this translation I venture, with much deference to the learned authorities *contra*, to protest, and that on more than one ground.

In the first place, if we take the words ὁ μεσίτης to introduce a general proposition, it is impossible to see their relevancy to the argument. This is shown by the hopeless disagreement as to the bearing of that proposition of all the authorities who uphold that translation.

Again, it is not easy to see on grammatical grounds why the article should not here be regarded as *individualising*, not generic. Granted that οὗτος ὁ μεσίτης would be the more usual expression, are we to say that St. Paul was so nice in his observance of grammatical rule, so pure in style, that he *could* not have used the article here in an individualising sense? The very form of expression [ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου. ὁ δὲ μεσίτης] in which the article, omitted with the noun first employed, appears when that noun is repeated as the subject of the following sentence, imparting a slight distinguishing emphasis to the noun so repeated, is found, *e.g.*, in this very epistle:

v. 13: ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε . . . μόνον μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν.

And v. 16: ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε. ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ.

And twice in the following verse, Romans v. 4: ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται. ἡ δὲ ὑπομονή δοκιμὴν, ἡ δὲ δοκιμή ἐλπίδα.

In the face of such examples from St. Paul's own epistles, examples which it would be easy to supplement from other Greek authors, it is surely somewhat rash to assert, as Bishop Ellicott does, that ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἐνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν must necessarily mean, "Now *every* mediator involves the idea of more than one." Why may we not, on the contrary, giving the individualising sense, as in the above passages, to the article, translate, "Now the Mediator (just referred to) is not of one," etc.?

There is one difficulty yet remaining, of which I shall offer an explanation which I have not seen put forward elsewhere, but for which, should it even on a first view appear somewhat startling, I beg, at least, a patient hearing. The translation which I suggest has, at all events, the merit of intelligibility, a not unimportant consideration, it will be admitted, in a controversy such as that in which the Apostle was then engaged.

"Now the mediator (in question) is not a mediator of *one* (*i.e.*, appointed to act by, or the nominee of one); but God is *One*."

The gist of the argument is now plain, viz., that the mediator here spoken of, Moses, not being appointed to act in his mediatorial capacity directly by One person, viz., by God, but by a *plurality* of persons, the angels, must be regarded as an angelic, not a Divine mediator, not the direct, but the indirect agent between God and man, and thus, as an inferior mediator, he gives a stamp of inferiority to the temporary and provisional system with which he was connected.

We can now see why St. Paul uses the *plural* number in speaking of the angelic ministration of the law on Mount Sinai, why he says δι' ἀγγέλων, as in Acts vii. 53, instead

of speaking of a *single* angel, as in Acts vii. 38, *μετὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ λαλοῦντος*, etc. It was because it suited his argument better to use the plural number, which he also believed the facts of the case justified him in using.

If any one objects to such an argument as trivial and unworthy of the subject, I reply that it is exactly similar to one which the apostle has used immediately before, *vv.* 16 foll. : " Now to Abraham were the promises spoken, and to his *seed*. He saith not to *seeds*, as of *many*, but as of *One*, and to thy *seed*."

The force of the argument in both these cases lies in a numerical opposition. If the apostle founded an argument upon this opposition in the one case, he may well have done so in the other.

Finally, we must remember that the whole discourse is a polemic directed against Judaising teachers, and is, to a large extent, an *argumentum ad hominem*. The Apostle is turning against his Judaising opponents the very arguments which they had employed to undermine the faith of his Galatian converts. He has attacked and routed his enemies on their own ground.

They trusted in the mediator Moses, but he shows that not only was Christ the Mediator of a better covenant, but that, strictly speaking, Moses was not a mediator of the One God, but only of the angelic host, "for," as he elsewhere (2 Tim. ii. 5) affirms with unqualified emphasis, "there is *One God*, *one Mediator* also between God and men, Himself Man, Christ Jesus."

A. A. BURD.

THE LORD'S SUPPER: ST. MARK OR ST. PAUL?

THE readers of the EXPOSITOR will not have forgotten the papers on "Harnack, Jülicher and Spitta on the Lord's Supper," contributed by Mr. Stewart to the July and August numbers of last year. The papers must have given the impression to many minds that a discussion of singular interest had been opened up, and that more would be heard on the subject. Of Harnack's contention, out of which this discussion sprang, that it was a matter of comparative indifference in the Church of the second century whether the Eucharistic cup was filled with wine and water or with water only, it may be that we shall not hear much more. But the stream then set in motion has flowed in a channel which Harnack may not have contemplated, and has broadened out into an inquiry as to the precise nature and import of the acts and words done and said by the Saviour on that night on which He was betrayed. The different traditions on the subject in the New Testament are being examined afresh, and their relation to each other discussed from every point of view. With some of the scholars engaged in it the inquiry presents a highly complicated appearance. Many must have felt in reading Mr. Stewart's account of the views of Spitta—a condensed but very accurate account, if I may presume to say so—that in that scholar's hands the problem was being overloaded, and assured results of criticism mixed up with speculative theories. The whole German controversy has been fully set forth in a book, which is by no means a small one, *Das Herrnmahl, nach Ursprung und Bedeutung, mit Rück-*

sicht auf die neuesten Forschungen untersucht (the Lord's Supper, an inquiry into its origin and meaning, in the light of the most recent investigations), by Rudolf Schäfer (Gütersloh, 1897). In this work many other views are rehearsed besides those reported by Mr. Stewart to the readers of the EXPOSITOR. While it is an excellent repertory of information on the subject, it is not much of a guide, and leaves a sense of bewilderment, approaching to despair, on the reader's mind.

I venture to place before the English reader an attempt at an analysis of two of the leading narratives of the institution in the New Testament, and an estimate of the respective historical significance of each. I am well aware that the elements of the problem here taken up only form part of it, and that a complete discussion must take account of many other matters. But to obtain some clearness as to the narratives in the Gospels and in Paul is the first and the indispensable preliminary to a successful treatment of the whole question.

The New Testament contains four accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper, that of the Apostle Paul in 1 Corinthians and those of the three Synoptic Gospels. In the fourth Gospel it is well known that no such account finds any place.¹ St. Luke's Gospel also stands in a peculiar position in this respect. In the text of Westcott and Hort, which is represented on the margin of the Revised Version, and which follows in this instance the authority of the Cambridge Codex, with a number of old Latin versions, St. Luke has scarcely any account of the institution. The German scholar, Blass, who is strongly interested in this Codex, in his recent book, *The Philology*

¹ Spitta considers that there was an account of the institution in John xiii., but that it fell out of the book; and that vi. 51-58 is an interpolation intended to supply the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, which had thus become an omission of the fourth Gospel. (*Urchristenthum*, 1, 186 sqq., and 216 sqq.)

of the Gospels, declares the account of the institution to be one of St. Luke's omissions. Should criticism decide, against these scholars, as it is on the whole inclined to do, that the latter half of verse 19 and the whole of verse 20 ought to stand, with the great body of the manuscripts in Luke xxii., as they do in the Textus Receptus and in our Authorised Version, then we have four narratives.

It will be convenient to give the various narratives here in a synopsis.

MARK xiv. 22-25.

And as they were eating He took a loaf and said the blessing and broke it and gave it to them and said, Take, this is My body. And He took a cup and gave thanks and gave it to them, and they all drank of it. And He said to them, This is My covenant-blood, which is poured out for many. Verily I say to you, I will never drink again of the fruit of the vine till that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.

MATTHEW xxvi. 26-29.

And as they were eating Jesus took a loaf and said the blessing and broke it and gave it to the disciples and said, Take, eat, this is My body. And He took a cup and gave thanks and gave it to them saying, Drink of it all of you : for this is My covenant-blood which is poured out for many, for forgiveness of sins. But I tell you I will not drink henceforward of this fruit of the vine till that day when I drink it with you new in the kingdom of My Father.

PAUL (1 COR. xi. 23-25).

For I received from the Lord, what I also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus, in the night in which He was given up, took a loaf, and after giving thanks broke it and said, This is My body which is for you : this do in remembrance of Me. In the same way also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in My blood ; this do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me.

LUKE xxii. 17-20.

(a) IN CODEX D (*Cantabrigiensis*).

(17) And He took a cup and gave thanks and said, Take this and divide it among yourselves ; (18) for I say to you, I will never drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine till the kingdom of God come. (19) And He took a loaf and gave thanks and broke it and gave it to them saying, This is My body,

(b) IN CODEX B (*Vaticanus*).

(17) And He took a cup and gave thanks and said, Take this and divide it among yourselves. (18) For I say to you, I will never drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine till the kingdom of God come. (19) And He took a loaf and gave thanks and broke it, and gave it to them saying, This is My body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of Me. And the cup in the same way after supper, saying, This cup, the new covenant in My blood, poured out for you.

When these narratives are closely compared, we see that they fall into two groups. St. Matthew and St. Mark agree together as against the other two, and St. Paul and St. Luke (in the *Vaticanus*) have a number of phrases in common which go beyond what we find in the first two. To the words found in Matthew and Mark, "This is My body," Paul and Luke add "which is for you": they add the words, "Do this in remembrance of Me": to the word "covenant" they add the adjective "new," and they add the preposition "in" or "by means of" in the same phrase. The covenant is said to be in or by means of the blood.

To take a step further, it is obvious that St. Luke is indebted to St. Paul, rather than St. Paul to St. Luke, since First Corinthians was written, as every one admits, earlier than any of the Gospels. The possibility that St. Luke drew independently from the same source as was used by St. Paul, is, of course, to be recognised; but if St. Luke was St. Paul's companion and assistant, and if St. Paul was the first to put the tradition in writing, it is difficult to see how the Gospel could be quite independent of the Epistle. St. Luke, it is true, has one phrase, "poured out for you," which St. Paul does not give, and which is similar to the "poured out for many" of the first two Gospels. But the phrase stands very awkwardly in the grammar of St. Luke's sentence, as in the Greek the word "poured out" agrees with the word "cup," not with the word "blood," to which it naturally belongs. The Sinaitic

Syriac omits the phrase, and perhaps it crept in from the other Gospels. In the other group, St. Mark's account may be regarded as the original of St. Matthew's. If the theory of the relation of these two Gospels be a true one, which is now held so generally, that St. Mark's Gospel was written first, and that it was closely followed by St. Matthew writing a few years later, then St. Mark's authority is to be regarded as the older in every case where there is no decisive evidence to the contrary. In this case St. Matthew, following, perhaps, the growing Church practice of his day, makes various slight additions to St. Mark's short and simple narrative.

We may notice here that if and so far as the narrative of Codex D in St. Luke xxii. 17-19 is to be taken as an account of the institution, it agrees with the shorter account of the first two Gospels rather than with the longer of St. Paul and St. Luke. If Westcott and Hort are right in preferring this text to that of Codex B,¹ and in regarding the latter as having been conformed to 1 Corinthians xi., then the three Gospels stand in line together with a shorter narrative, and Paul stands alone with that which is longer and more elaborate.

I shall take St. Mark's narrative as representing the simpler tradition on the subject, and I shall venture to compare it carefully with that of St. Paul. It is true that the Pauline narrative was the first to be written down, but it does not follow that it must therefore be a better witness for the original facts. The Apostle says that he received it "from the Lord," but he does not mean by these words to claim direct revelation for his narrative. He does make that claim for some of his acts and teachings, but he does not make it here. What he does claim is that the regulation he is laying down for the observance of the Lord's Supper has more than his own personal authority behind

¹ The New Testament in Greek. Appendix, p. 83.

it, that this is a matter on which he shares a common tradition with the Christians of the older Churches. The Lord, who is the head of all the Churches, is the ultimate source of the order the Apostle wishes to see observed; through what channel the tradition reached him, which he now goes on to communicate, he does not say. He may have got it from those who were apostles before him, from Peter specially, whom he knew best of their number. But the tradition was current in every part of the Church; he would hear it before he was converted, and learn it at Antioch as well as at Jerusalem.

St. Mark also was connected with Peter, and, according to a tradition which is now meeting with more acceptance than formerly, St. Mark wrote down St. Peter's reminiscences of the Lord's sayings and doings. The presbyter quoted by Papias to this effect takes exception for various reasons to Mark's Gospel, but he immediately connects him with St. Peter. Thus we are in the position that both the principal accounts of the institution may be due to some contact with the same source. If they differ from each other, we cannot at once conclude that Paul's account deserves the preference because it was first written down. The circumstances of the transmission have to be considered in each case, and the character of the works in which the accounts respectively appear. If Mark's Gospel has come by recent movements in criticism to be regarded as the most original of the first three, and as containing a very faithful reproduction of very early sources, its general character must tell in its favour in this instance also.

But the first and most important thing to do in order to an understanding of the varying traditions on the subject, is to examine each of the two accounts in its own connection, and to make out its exact purport.

To understand the story in Mark we require to go back some way, and to examine the teaching of Jesus already

reported in the second Gospel, of which this is the sequel and the keystone, on the subject of His death. For some time past, in this Gospel, Jesus has had that subject before His mind, and it is even possible to trace some development of thought in His utterances about it. The notion that the Messiah should die was one to which it was unspeakably hard for the Jewish mind in that age to adjust itself; and it was Jesus Himself who first wrestled with this dark problem, and made His way, not without pain and anguish, to a firm conclusion as to the meaning and the purpose of the death of the Messiah. I shall enumerate what appear from Mark's narrative to have been the principal stages of His thought on this subject.

1. There is the simple announcement that He sees death impending over Him, without as yet any attempt to determine what the event can mean, or what use it is to serve. (viii. 31, ix. 31, x. 33.) I believe that Jesus really uttered these intimations, and that they were not put into His mouth, as many have held, *post eventum*. He tells His disciples repeatedly that He sees death in His path, and He always says at the same time that His death will not be the end of His person or His cause, but that, after a brief obscurity, He will return.

2. He spoke of His death as a divine ordinance, and, which is the same thing, as being foretold in Scripture. If God wills it, and if it is spoken of in Scripture, the Messiah must die. God's will must be accomplished and not man's, and the Son cannot think of refusing what the Heavenly Father has ordained for Him. This view scarcely differs from the first, and appears in the very earliest intimation (viii. 31) in connection with it. To our logic it is one thing to say that the event was foreseen as certainly impending, and another thing to say that it was divinely ordained; but to one convinced unwaveringly of his own Messiahship, the two views are one.

3. But what purpose was the death of the Messiah to serve? One answer Jesus found to this question was that the death of the Messiah would bring about a crisis in the affairs of the Jewish State. In the parable of the vineyard (xii. 1-9), when the heir is killed by the tenants, the owner comes at once to destroy those tenants, and give the vineyard to others. His death is to be the turning-point; very soon after it He will drink wine at the great banquet in the Kingdom of God.

4. But the death of the Messiah is also to serve a specific purpose in the inauguration of the Kingdom. He gives "His life a ransom for many" (x. 45). These words probably presented to the disciples at first, and ought to suggest to us also, a parable rather than a doctrine. They must, at any rate, imply that many would be in the Kingdom and enjoy its blessings, who, if the Messiah did not stoop to death, must remain outside. He died for others, to save them, to free them, to secure to them the Kingdom. How His death acts to bring about this result is not explained. At all events the terrible occurrence He foresees so plainly has received in His eyes this glorifying hue, to His taste this sweetening savour, that it is for others. He dies to bring to many a benefit they would not otherwise have had, and when He thinks of them, the death of the Messiah, unnatural and dreadful as it is, has a redeeming quality, and is not all horror.

And now we come to the words connected with the bread and the cup. Every one agrees that Christ spoke them with reference to His death. They were spoken just after He had been speaking of what was to happen to His body after His death (xiv. 8), and He has accordingly quite made up His mind that death is just about to overtake Him. But His views about His death need not have changed, though it approached so near. And we naturally expect that in what is said now, the former

teaching, that which we have been considering, will be confirmed, and perhaps carried a step further. Let us examine then what we find here.

In the first place Jesus takes up a loaf—a round scone or cake (bread is made in that form in the East, and a loaf was about enough for the meal of one person)—and He does something with it, and draws the attention of all the company to it and says something about it. Well, that is the way in which Jesus generally taught His lessons. He chose some common object, put a child before the company, or called for a piece of money, or fixed His hearers' attention on some familiar figure, a sower or a fisher, or on a seed, or on a house, and then He spoke of it in a way to make the hearers think of some matter He wished them to understand. "Look at that," He said, "and find out something from it." "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear."

Now, suppose that on the occasion now before us Jesus was employing that method of teaching which He generally followed. In that case the words He uses will have to be taken not as doctrine, not as explicit statement of what was to be apprehended, but as suggestion. What He actually meant to convey was not stated, the hearers were to discover it, and we also have to see if we can discover it.

If we try to interpret the act and speech of Jesus in this way, we must notice that it is not the Passover or any part of it that He sets up to be considered. It is just a loaf, such as would be on the table at any meal, anywhere, and on every day of the week. The cup, too, said by St. Paul to have been taken after supper was over, is an ordinary feature of any meal where there was any pretence of good cheer. The synoptists give no details of the meal, and tell us nothing about the lamb or the bitter herbs, or the successive cups which formed part of

the Passover meal.¹ We do not hear what was on the table, except that there was a loaf and a cup, things by no means peculiar to the Passover.

The loaf and the cup, then, are, on this view, symbols freely chosen to convey a certain lesson. But they draw all their significance from the way in which the Lord treats them and speaks of them. For the last time Jesus acts as host of His little body of intimates. He was sitting in the place of host already, as He had often done, but now He begins to act again as if it were the beginning of a meal, and as if the company had just sat down. As on the occasion when the multitude was fed at the lakeside, so now again, He bears Himself as one who has something to give for which all are looking. He takes up a loaf as if those present were hungry and He proposed to satisfy their appetite; He says the blessing, as the father commonly did in a Jewish household. The action, which, as it occurs here, is no part of the Passover ritual, is a very deliberate one, done with all due form and circumstance, so as to convey its full meaning and make the deepest impression. Then He breaks the bread, each is to have part of it, and He hands it to them.

What is the meaning of this act? The disciples were not hungry like the multitude at the Sea of Galilee; their supper was over, or drawing to a close, and they had eaten more than bread. The point of the action could scarcely appear to them to lie in the nourishment they were to derive from the piece of bread handed to them;

¹ In Mark and Matthew there is nothing to show that the meal was the Passover, except the story of the preparation (Mark xiv. 12-16), which Spitta proposes to get rid of as an interpolation. If Jesus suffered, as Spitta, following the Johannine tradition, maintains, on the day of the Passover, He cannot have eaten that meal with His disciples. But the narrative of the preparation is, when rightly understood, very simple and natural; and Luke xxii. 15 can scarcely mean, as Spitta takes it, that Jesus was so anxious to eat the Passover with His disciples, that He had arranged to do so on the day before the right date.

the act must have seemed to be prompted, not by their needs, but by their Master's feeling and by His desire to express Himself. And the words accompanying the act confirm this impression. "Take: this is My body"—that is all that St. Mark gives. What are they to gather from this? Surely that as He gives the bread to them, so He gives His body to them. In respect of the bread the act is being repeated which He had often done with them before; He is head of the party, father of the family; at meals He is in the position of giver, they are receivers. So with His body; He is just about to give it up; He has already thought of what will be done to it after He dies. With respect to His body also, He would have them think that He is giver, they receivers. That is the view He has come to take of His death, and which He wishes them to take also. Till now, when He spoke of His death they did not believe Him; but the hour is near when they will have to believe Him, and when that dark hour comes He would have them interpret His death in the right way. They are to think that it did not overwhelm Him unprepared, nor bring His purpose to naught; but that He was a voluntary agent in His death, and willingly gave up His life for the good to be secured thereby to them and others, by opening to them the doors of the Kingdom. The bread is His body, not in point of the breaking—that is only a necessary incident in the action; the bread has to be broken that they may all partake of it; and He could not expect that His body would be broken, as in fact it was not—but in point of the giving.

At this point the lesson is complete, but, as often occurs in the teaching of Jesus, it is doubled. Prof. Jülicher, writer of an admirable book on the parables, who has also written one of the best papers on the Lord's Supper in the present discussion, and regards the acts as parables, refers here to the twin parables of the leaven and of the mustard-

seed, of the lost sheep and the lost piece of money, of the patched coat and of the new wine in the old skins. Other pairs also may occur to us. The second parable usually repeats the first, but adds to it some fresh suggestions. And this is the case here. The subject is the same. The cup, like the loaf, is a very common object, which is at hand, but it is invested with a profoundly solemn meaning. Again Jesus acts as the Head of the family, again He causes all present to look to Him for something He is to give them. He takes a cup with wine in it, says the blessing as before; each of them is to take it as from Him, and to find a meaning in the act. The explanation goes somewhat further than the former one did. The wine, like the bread, stands for His person, His life, which He is giving up; but more is said about the meaning of the death. The cup, He says, is His covenant-blood, poured out for many. This phrase has been thought by some scholars to be Pauline. Paul, no doubt, speaks of the old and the new covenant, and of the great change the new one brought, in a way of his own. But perhaps the word covenant, used, not as expressing a definite doctrine of a changed relation, but allusively, to indicate a view that could be thought of, does not go beyond what was natural in the mouth of Jesus Himself. Covenant-blood is the blood of a sacrifice which is offered up at the opening of a new relation. (See Exod. xxiv. 8.) And Jesus has it in His mind that His death makes a crisis in the fortunes of the Jewish state, at least. The vineyard is to pass into new hands, the Kingdom is just about to appear, and, as in the use of other treaties and conventions, there is a sacrifice at the inauguration of it. If we ask what kind of a treaty or covenant Jesus may have thought of, the great passage in Jeremiah xxxi. 31 occurs to us, where the new covenant God is to bring, which is no covenant at all, but a life of God with man in full communion and confidence, is contrasted with the old cove-

nant, so often broken in spite of the efforts made by the prophets to keep the people faithful to it. Jesus may well have had that passage before His mind. But a tragical act is to be accomplished before that covenant which is no covenant comes into operation. Does the idea of a sacrifice suggest itself at the inauguration of the Kingdom, and may the blood which is to flow be conceived as being that of the Messiah Himself? Is the covenant-blood that of the Founder of the Kingdom? And if this is the case, does Jesus shrink from the hard fate which is coming upon Him? Does He desire that the Kingdom could have been brought without this sad accompaniment? He would not have His disciples think so. He was not living in any fanatical exaltation, and had not overcome the repugnance of human nature against violence and outrage. Within an hour or two that would appear. But at the board with His disciples He teaches them in a form never to be forgotten that He is a free agent in His death. If a sacrifice was wanted, as it might be thought, He was prepared to be that sacrifice. As freely and gladly as He pours out wine for His dear friends, who look to Him as their head, so freely and unreservedly does He give His life for them. In view of the blessing it was to bring to others, death lost its terrors for Him; He welcomed it as the supreme opportunity of doing a service to those He loved, and for whom He had gone through all His labours and conflicts.

The words of the institution, "Do this in remembrance of Me," are absent from St. Mark's narrative, and are not, even in the view of those who adopt the parabolic interpretation, necessarily to be supplied to it. St. Mark's story, taken by itself, is not an account of the foundation of a rite, but of a pathetic and solemn self-revelation on the part of Jesus, and probably also of the teaching of a lesson He wished the disciples to learn. Indeed, in this Gospel, words are placed in the mouth of Christ which make us

doubt whether St. Mark could contemplate in this passage the foundation of any institution for the Church, since they represent Him as looking forward to a reunion with His disciples after the very briefest interval. My interpretation of the acts and accompanying words differs in some details from those proposed by Jülicher and Spitta; but I am at one with them and with Weiszäcker in considering that St. Mark's narrative, taken by itself, does not record the institution of a rite, but a piece of symbolic teaching.

It will at once be seen that this view has formidable difficulties to encounter. Let us see what attempts may be made to overcome these. One great difficulty is that the Lord's Supper was undoubtedly observed in the Church from the very earliest days. True, the rite occurs in early times under different forms. In Acts we read of the "breaking of bread" only. In the Didaché the cup precedes the bread, as in the more archaic narrative in Luke. Still there is everywhere a rite, which Christians observe regularly, as if the Lord had told them to do so. Now, if St. Mark's narrative is correctly interpreted when treated as above, and if the Lord accordingly did not institute a rite to be repeated, how did that rite come into existence? And how are we to account for the narrative of the Apostle Paul, earliest written of all the accounts, in which the Lord is represented as directing the disciples to repeat His acts?

If the interpretation I have given of St. Mark's narrative is sound, then it follows apparently that the disciples came very early to misunderstand their Master, and to represent Him as ordering the repetition of these acts when He had not done so. To this it may be answered that Mark and Matthew at least did not misunderstand Him, but furnish a narrative in which the original meaning of the words still shines through. But more, it is perhaps not very difficult to represent to ourselves a very natural process by which the acts done by Jesus in bidding His disciples farewell,

acts in which so much was expressed, and in which memory and reverence for the Lord saw an ever-increasing wealth of meaning and a greater depth of pathos, how these acts came almost immediately to be regarded as the deliberate institution of a rite for the Church. At first the believers hardly needed any rites; they expected their Master to return so soon that everything was in suspense, and they could only wait for the new set of institutions He would give them when He came. At their meetings meanwhile they spoke of the strange fact of His death, so darkly contrary to all they had expected; and when they met together in the evening and broke bread with one another, they remembered how He had presided over their party, and how He did so the last night of His life, and made the bread and wine on the table convey to them His last thoughts about His death. Thus they showed forth His death till He should come, and explained it to themselves by repeating the explanation He Himself had given them in the common substances of bread and wine. Here were all the elements of a rite of religion—a common meal in which the absent Head was felt to be near, and His tragic fortunes represented in the simplest acts of eating and drinking—a meal, therefore, which, each time it took place, bound each believer afresh to the absent yet present Lord and bound them all together. Surely then the Lord meant these acts to be repeated, surely it was by His foresight and arrangement that believers enjoyed all the comforts and blessings they found in repeating them. He meant us to do this, they said; this practice we have formed was just what He had in view that night when He was so calm and full of courage, and His friends were so bewildered and forsook Him. If not the Master on earth, yet the Lord in heaven could be heard enjoining the repetition. And thus the words of the institution came to be added to the narrative: “Do this in remembrance of Me.”

This brings us to the Apostle Paul and to his account of the institution. That account is given for a certain purpose. It is intended to correct the disorders which attended the observance of the Lord's Supper at Corinth. The Christians there did not keep their religious rite distinct enough from their ordinary supper, which, like Greek clubs and guilds, they took together in the evening. They did not distinguish the Lord's body sufficiently, nor show forth the Lord's death in a proper fashion. They simply ate their evening meal in the same room; sitting in company at their food indeed, but in an irregular and even an unbrotherly way, each devouring the private supplies he had brought with him, the rich brother having too much, the poor too little. In these circumstances the Lord's Supper properly so called was lost sight of; the meal should have been, or should have contained as a distinct feature, the observance of the Lord's Supper, but this had almost ceased to be the case. St. Paul, therefore, wishes a fixed order introduced at these meetings, so that they may be more brotherly in their character, and also more markedly religious. They are not to be as formerly, a mere feast which could be attended to as well at home, but a ceremony, a rite. And that this may be done, he gives a narrative of the first institution. He had given them this before, when the Church of Corinth was founded, but he repeats what he had said, as they have lost sight of it. If they attend to the account of the institution which he gives them, it will be impossible for them to fall into such confusion about the Lord's Supper again. The account he gives them, therefore, is intended as a type for Church practice. He means to insist on the acts perhaps rather than on the words, and especially on the due order and sequence of the acts. These acts are not to be entered on till all the brothers have arrived, and they are to be done deliberately, solemnly, with clear intention and perception

of their meaning. As for the words, the Apostle does not prescribe that the very words he rehearses to the Corinthians are to be repeated at every observance; all he distinctly insists on is that the meaning of the acts is what these words indicate, and that when the acts are done that meaning is to be clearly remembered and dwelt upon. If the acts are done with clear emphasis, and if the meaning of them, as set forth in these words of Christ, is properly realised, then the observance will be, as it ought always to be, a showing forth of Christ's death; the Lord's body will be distinguished and kept in a place by itself, instead of being mixed up with the promiscuous viands of the common meal. No offence will be committed against the bread and the cup (the cup, it is clearly indicated, is to be after supper), which possess such sacred associations. Other points connected with the ordinance are left for adjustment when the Apostle comes to Corinth; in the meantime he gives them this narrative.

On examining St. Paul's account of the institution, we find that it differs from that of St. Mark, just as the different situations and motives of the two writers would lead us to expect. St. Mark is a historian, who deals in carefully treasured reminiscence. He does not compose freely, but reproduces materials furnished to him in various ways, adding to them, no doubt, in many passages, some arrangement and colour of his own, but in the passage before us giving surely the exact words of his source. St. Paul, on the other hand, comes before us here as a Church statesman, who has practical ends to serve in the Churches he has founded, and who holds very strongly a doctrine which he regards as the one and only gospel. With all his merits he is not a historian, interested in facts for their own sake; and in particular the facts of the earthly life of Christ are of subordinate importance to him. That is a noticeable feature of his writings, and there is a reason for it, since it

is after the spirit, not after the flesh, that he is determined to know Christ. Now, the account of the institution had not attained liturgical fixity when Paul came to deal with it, but was subject to modification at his hands, and at the hands of others, such as the first and the third Evangelist, and in particular the words spoken by the Saviour were liable to alteration. They were not, perhaps, regarded by others, any more than by Paul himself, as ritually fixed and as necessarily to be repeated at each observance, but were valued as fixing the sense in which the acts were to be understood to which they were attached.

St. Paul's account, therefore, presents various changes on the old Jerusalem tradition as given by St. Mark. These changes might be almost imperceptible at first, in a matter which had as yet so little fixity, but to us they are noticeable enough. On the one hand the living Church rite reflects itself on the narrative of the institution; and on the other the specific Pauline doctrine is at work; the rite, according to this account, shows forth Christ's death according to the meaning and effect that death possesses in the Pauline system.

Of smaller changes, we may notice that St. Paul does not state to whom the bread and the cup were given by the Lord. He has the words "took, blessed, broke," but omits the word "gave." Perhaps this makes the narrative more general, more fitted for a Church rite. The Corinthians are not required to think of those Galilean disciples to whom the bread was originally given, but only of the Head of the Church doing the acts for all His followers in every land, which they now repeat. That might be represented as a small point, but it is an additional alteration in the same direction that, instead of speaking as St. Mark does of "a" cup which Jesus took, the Apostle speaks of "the" cup. It is the cup familiar to Christians that is spoken of; the Church celebration is carried back by the unconscious

phrase to that first evening. And the cup is placed after supper, a point St. Mark and St. Matthew do not mention ; it has a place of its own ; it is not a mere drinking during the common meal that is to be thought of, but a marked observance, a rite separated by its position from vulgar things.

For St. Mark's words accompanying the bread, "Take, this is My body," St. Paul gives, "This is My body for you." There is a difference. "Take, this is My body" is the natural dramatic speech of the original scene, expressing the Saviour's act and feeling as at first conceived. "This is My body for you" is a difficult phrase, as may be seen from the various participles added to it in the variants, the "broken" (*κλώμενον*) of the Authorised Version, discarded by the Revisers, the "broken" (*θρυπτόμενον*) in another Greek word, found in some copies, and the "given" (*διδόμενον*) of St. Luke. The brief phrase now standing in the text, however, is less dramatic, more doctrinal than St. Mark's ; it has less in it of the original situation, more, perhaps, of what the body of Christ given up to death has come to be to believers afterwards, as the standing permanent symbol of the supreme devotion in which Christ gave Himself for them, for their atonement and justification.

Of the words, "This do in remembrance of Me," we have already spoken. They constitute what is no doubt the principal difference between the two narratives. The Lord's Supper must have assumed, even with the Jerusalem apostles—by whom, as well as by others, Paul may have been informed—something of the character of the Passover (in connection with which it was thought by some to have been instituted), as a memorial observance (Exod. xii. 14) ; it fills up the gap between the Lord's removal and His coming again ; Christians declare at each observance of it the sense in which they regard His death, and they believe that He Himself bade them do this.

The "covenant-blood" of St. Mark is with St. Paul the "new covenant in, or by means of, 'My Blood.'" The allusion or suggestion has passed into a doctrine. The covenant which with Jesus Himself simply denotes the institution of the Kingdom in which God and man were to dwell together in an intimacy never reached before, is with Paul the new covenant, his views of which are well known to us. With him the death of Christ brings to an end the old covenant made through Moses; the law has come to an end, the power of the flesh is broken, the spirit rules instead of the letter, and liberty prevails instead of coercion and servitude (2 Cor. iii. and *passim*). So immense a change was wrought according to the Apostle by the death of Christ in man's relation with God, and the words used in the Lord's Supper proclaim that change distinctly.

The rite speaks in 1 Corinthians the language of Pauline theology, of that doctrine of Christ crucified and set forth in His blood by God as a propitiation through which believers should be justified. It was Paul who developed this doctrine; it is to his writings that we turn when we wish to expound or to insist upon that doctrine. And as this account of the rite is from Paul's pen, it seems not unnatural to suppose that it was he who made it speak this language. He saw clearly the immense importance of the rite for Christianity. It is he who first declares that the bread and the cup are to Christianity what sacrifice is to the Jewish and to Gentile religion. This bread, this cup, are the distinctive symbol, he declares, of the new religion, and identify the Christian with Christ, as the Gentile sacrifice identified the Greek with Dionysus or with Artemis. When he was called, as we see that he was, to mould the rite in Corinth in a more fixed form than it had previously possessed there, we cannot wonder if he made it express more fully than before that doctrine of the Cross which it

had been the work of his life to develop, and which was to him of such immeasurable importance.

The interpretations I have offered of the narrative of the earliest Evangelist, and of that of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, would form some contribution, should they be accepted, to the early history of the rite of the Lord's Supper in the New Testament. There is, no doubt, much in them that can only be regarded as hypothetical. It must be recognised that the materials for coming to a judgment are very scanty. The narrative of St. Mark is brief and enigmatical. The meaning given to it above is that which appears to me to be most in accordance with the line of thought running through the second Gospel as a whole, and with the manner of statement which prevails in it. But the brief narrative admits perhaps of more than one interpretation. St. Mark was, of course, familiar with the Church rite of the Lord's Supper, and he may have meant his narrative as an account of the institution of that rite. He does not say that this is what he means by it; he does not say that he does not mean this. For each interpretation of the passage strong arguments may be brought forward. Again, with regard to the words, "Do this in remembrance of Me," there is a great difficulty on either side. If Jesus did not say these words, we have to account both for the repetition of His acts in the Church from the very earliest times, and for the placing of the words in His mouth. I have shown how these difficulties may be met, but the hypotheses by means of which this is done are much debated, and can never have the character of certainty. On the other hand, if Jesus used these words, how are we to account for St. Mark's narrative, for that of St. Matthew, written a few years later, and for that of St. Luke in Westcott and Hort's text—in all of which the words do not appear? If Jesus did intend to found a rite, and actually expressed Himself to

that effect in the presence of Peter and the other disciples, then why do St. Mark and St. Matthew not say so? The difficulties are great on every side.

I venture to conclude with two remarks of a practical tendency. The first is that this controversy will never have any influence on the celebration of the Lord's Supper in our Churches. Whether the Lord founded the ordinance consciously or unconsciously, whether the words "Do this in remembrance of Me" proceeded first from Jesus on earth or from Christ in heaven, He is the Founder of the ordinance, and we shall use these words. The fact will not be changed that the Lord's Supper brings us very near to the Saviour at that hour at which, knowing that His death was at hand, He triumphed over death by the love He bore to men, and willingly gave Himself up to die for them. We shall be no less disposed to set forth our celebration of the dying love of the Saviour with all the dignity and solemnity which the centuries have gathered round it.

And my second practical remark is, that the New Testament lays down no strict ritual of the Lord's Supper, but regards it in a rich variety of aspects. Those Christians, therefore, who appeal to the New Testament as the standard of their religion, are free themselves, and must allow liberty to others, to connect with the acts done in the ordinance, so long as due regard is paid to reverence and order and charity, such views and doctrines as appear to them most true and most in accordance with the spirit of their Master.

ALLAN MENZIES.

SOME POINTS IN PAULINE HISTORY AND CHRONOLOGY.

THE Epistle to the Galatians is so central in our knowledge of the apostolic age; so much defines itself, directly or indirectly, by its help; that one may be pardoned for adding one to the many discussions that have sprung into being since Prof. Ramsay's stimulating rehandling of the Galatian question, if haply some fresh point may be fixed or some old error be yet further discredited. Recently a new interest has been aroused in Pauline chronology through the concentration of attention upon the date of Paul's release from his imprisonment at Cæsarea in consequence of the coming of Porcius Festus to succeed Felix as procurator. But though O. Holtzmann, Harnack, and McGiffert have satisfied themselves that they have here hit on a really fixed point in Pauline chronology, yet the fixity claimed is open to the gravest doubts. The data on which they build are themselves precarious. Tacitus and Josephus are at variance: next, Josephus is at variance with himself; and lastly, as was well shown in the *EXPOSITOR* for February (1898) by Prof. B. W. Bacon, the statement in Josephus on which the whole synchronism depends is probably a wild guess to explain the difficulty of a rascal like Felix escaping the reward of his crimes. Such being apparently the state of the case, we return once more to see what can be made of old "fixed points" like the Judæan famine under the procurator Tiberius Alexander (46-48), taken in connexion with the Epistle to the Galatians, when this is read steadily in the light of the now dominant South-Galatian theory.

Prof. Ramsay has re-opened several important questions relating to this Epistle by his vigorous assault on the current identification of the second visit named in it with the third visit of Acts, and by his strong plea for identifying it

with the second of Acts, namely, that occasioned by the Judæan famine. On both these points he has failed as yet to convince the body of Biblical scholars, and notably Dr. Sanday amongst ourselves. It is the fear lest the well-earned weight of the latter's name should tend to paralyse earnest, independent reflexion in others—the last thing he himself would countenance, but a danger which has been proved real in the analogous case of Bishop Lightfoot—that partly urges me to make confession of a belief that the truth lies more with his opponent in their friendly contention.¹ Yet not the complete truth. There is too much of a deadlock in the situation as conceived by the two sides, and too little of truth's equilibrium. To show what is meant, it may be best to say outright that each side seems stronger critically than constructively; so that I can accept neither Acts xv. nor Acts xi. 30 as an adequate parallel to Galatians ii. 1–10. Further, while quite at one with Ramsay in insisting that it was with the origin of his Gospel, *when he evangelized the Galatians*, that Paul was primarily concerned in *Galatians*;² I am equally at one with Dr. Sanday in holding it incumbent on him to refer, if only to refute misrepresentation, to the Jerusalem compact of Acts xv., *assuming that Galatians was written subsequent to that event*. From which it will be seen that my purpose is (1) To assert the need of assuming a visit to the Jerusalem apostles unrecorded in Acts; (2) To find an appropriate date for Galatians prior to the Concordat of Acts xv.,

¹ EXPOSITOR, V. iii. pp. 81 foll.

² For the proof of this, the words, "I marvel that ye are so quickly changing" (i. 6), are far more crucial than "Now, at any rate, is it men rather than God whom I am trying to win over" (i. 10), to which alone Dr. Sanday refers in this connexion. Lightfoot is here on our side; while, as to the general question, it is to be noted that in holding that Paul's second visit coincided with Acts xv. he did so on the assumption that Acts xv. had preceded the first preaching to the "North Galatians." The "South-Galatian" theory changes all that, and leaves Lightfoot's judgment with Ramsay as to the logic of the situation, though against his denial that Paul had (on his dating of the Epistle) any need to refer to the Concordat at all.

so making it the earliest of the extant Pauline letters; (3) To draw out one or two corollaries of the theory suggested.

One preliminary objection may be named and speedily dismissed. "Is it allowable to fall back on a visit of which the author of Acts tells us nothing?" It is, because there is a clear analogy, namely, the absence from Acts of any hint that Paul retired soon after his conversion "into Arabia," and did not at once begin his preaching in Damascus. In the one case as in the other the reason is probably the same, and that is, unacquaintance with the more private side of the Apostle's life prior to the beginning of the "we" passages. If it be said that the assumed visit was too much a part of Paul's public history to come under this law; that, on the contrary, it was just such a crisis in the Gentile mission as must have found a place in Acts; one may reply, first, that we do not know enough of Luke's sources to say confidently that it must have stood in them; and next, that its exact significance for the *outward* history of the Gentile mission is just the point at issue. Paul himself speaks of the matter as in purpose and scope a *private* conference, and nothing more; and some attempt will be made to justify the expression both historically and exegetically.

1. Ramsay, as I have said, seems to hold the field in his attack on the equation, Galatians ii. 1-10 equals Acts xv. Surely "Paul's argument (in Gal. i. ii.) is founded on the rarity of his visits"; and either his candour or his credit for ability to anticipate an enemy's retort must suffer, if he really passed over in silence a visit to Jerusalem in so formal an enumeration without explaining why he did so.¹

¹ To suppose that he omitted the visit of Acts xi. 30 because the famine relief was actually conveyed to the Elders and not the Apostles, does not really meet the point as to expediency: for the Galatians could not be assumed to know anything about the visit and its true nature. Further, the assumption that the visit coincided with the date at which the apostles might be thought to be in hiding, *i.e.* the early months of 44 A.D., is untenable, seeing that we

And what shall we say of the bold assertion in Galatians ii. 6, that the recognised authorities imposed no extra conditions on his Gospel, if we suppose that on the same visit Paul agreed to the four abstinences of Acts xv. 20 and proceeded to promulgate them among his own Galatians, who were not even included in the primary scope of the conference (Acts xvi. 4)? The very fact that Paul does name a matter of practical piety as having been agreed to on the occasion described in Galatians ii. 10—but that something different from the points named in Acts xv. 20—only serves to clinch the contradiction. But when Ramsay would have us see in Galatians ii. 1–10 a natural account (in another context) of the visit recorded in Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, we can only murmur a *non possumus*. Why should Paul not have said outright that what took him up to Jerusalem the second time was nothing implying dependence on the apostles for his teaching, but a charitable mission on behalf of the Antiochène Church? This would have met Judaizing insinuation quite as effectively, to say the least, as the explanation given of the motive of his first visit. Instead of this, he ignores all but the personal occasion of his visit; for I cannot be sure that he means the Galatians to see in Galatians ii. 10 a direct reference to the famine fund. We have no right to assume the Galatians in a position to take up the hint involved, even though Ramsay's exegesis of the passage were correct, which we may later take occasion to question. Hence the one explicit clue as to the situation is the circumstance emphasized by Paul himself, namely, that it was "in pursuance of a revelation" that he, Barnabas, and Titus then visited the leaders in Jerusalem. Beyond this the conditions described are just such as might have held good of a conference between the same persons

have no right to place the famine before 45 (46)–47. Hence there was nothing to hinder the insinuation that on this occasion, too, Paul had been a learner from apostles.

during any part of the period between the first preaching to Gentiles at Antioch (which is the only view that satisfies the antithesis to "Jews" in the context of Acts xi. 20) and the Jerusalem compact itself. Paul and Barnabas, the leading apostles, certain Pharisaically-minded interlopers, Paul's unique grace visible in his call, his insight, and his successful work—as exemplified in Titus (who was probably an Antiochene)—such factors were peculiar to no date between about 43 and 49 A.D. And while we seem precluded from putting this visit, determined by revelation, after the second visit in Acts, I see no valid objection to placing it not long prior to that event.

Dr. Sanday, indeed, considers "that Galatians ii. 1-10 implies a more advanced stage of the controversy with the Judaists than could have been reached" so early as 43-46, which, with the exception of the early months of 44, when Peter was in hiding, is the period open for a visit prior even to that recorded in Acts xi. 30. But not only does he take the contextually unsatisfactory view of Acts xi. 20 (against many good critics), but he also seems to exaggerate or misconstrue such advance as took place in Paul's own mind touching "his gospel," which he always conceived to have been substantially one in principle. To ignore or minimize this is to run in the teeth of the whole argument of Galatians, as well as of a passage like Acts xxii. 17-21. To sum up his "gospel of the uncircumcision" prior to the so-called first missionary journey as nothing more than "occasional preaching to proselytes," is surely unwarranted. But even were it the case that in Syria-Cilicia, and subsequently at Antioch, Paul had preached only to proselytes, as contrasted with pure heathen, yet the proselytes were many of them uncircumcised (like Cornelius and his friends); and *when once these became a large proportion of any ecclesia* the problem of the Uncircumcision already began to stare the leaders of the Church in the face. Galatians ii. 1-10 does

not suggest to my mind "a cleavage, a great and deep cleavage, in the Church: the Christians of Gentile origin being on one side, those of Jewish origin on the other." It is not as yet a question of the rank and file at all, and of their consciousness of the two gospels.¹ The question is one as to how far the leaders, or more correctly St. Paul, then saw into the coming issue as to uncircumcised Gentiles. And Galatians ii. 1-10, read on its own merits, conveys the impression of a conference meant to be one of leaders alone, in which the difficulties foreseen by the most far-sighted man in the Church were anticipated. And so, by a private understanding between the "Pillars" of either Mission, the way was safeguarded for further development, such as Paul himself was probably already contemplating. In fact the first Missionary Journey is best viewed as the firstfruits of the private compact of Galatians ii. 1-10, while the relief visit of Acts xi. 30 is its earlier seal. In this light too it is easier to see how Paul could agree to refer the controversy of Acts xv. 1, 2 to the Apostles and Elders in Jerusalem without really running the seeming risk of staking his Gospel on the result (in the face of Gal. i. 1).

The way being so far freed from objections, a positive consideration, pointing to a date prior to the visit of Acts xi. 30, may now be advanced for what it is worth. Ramsay, in considering the phrase "in pursuance of a revelation," observes that the wonderful revelation referred to by Paul in 2 Corinthians xii. 2-4 probably occurred in 43 or 44, namely the fourteenth year before 56 A.D. "But," he adds, "all speculation is barred by the description": Paul "heard unspeakable words which it is not lawful for man to utter." This is pressing Paul's words to absurdity. For what was the use of a revelation that revealed nothing that could in any form be com-

¹ I see no evidence that the "false brethren" of Galatians ii. 4 had ever been out of Jerusalem, as Dr. Sanday assumes.

municated? The *ipsissima verba*, no doubt, could not be reproduced; but the lesson brought home would affect his subsequent thought and teaching on the subjects involved. What the burden of the "revelation" actually was, can perhaps be inferred, not only from the interest round which his whole apostolate centred, but also from another passage in which he refers to his exceptional insight into the mysteries of the gospel. In Ephesians iii. 4 ff. he speaks of "the dispensation of the grace of God" that had been given to him towards the Gentiles, in that by way of revelation had been made known to him "the mystery," to wit, that the Gentiles are fellow-heirs, co-members in a body, and co-sharers in the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel, whereof he had been made a minister according to the free bounty of the grace of God given unto him "according to the inworking of His power." Is it really hazardous to maintain that the revelation of 2 Corinthians xii. 2-4 marked a fresh and overwhelming glimpse into the scope of his distinctive gospel, "the mystery hidden during the ages in God"? If so, this experience came to him about 43-44 (or even 42-43, if 55 be the better date for 2 Cor.), and may well have caused him to brood upon the steps needful to give this secret of the intrinsic oneness of Jew and Gentile in Christ yet further effect than that already realized at Antioch.

The suggestion then is, that it was during this season of deep meditation on the practical problems involved in full obedience to this revelation (in which the original "heavenly vision" found maturer interpretation), that the ἀποκάλυψις or intimation of the Divine will, spoken of in Galatians ii. 1, led him to take the step of conferring with the Jerusalem apostles. He went up in order that the unity of the Ecclesia or Body of the Christ might be safeguarded by an explicit mutual understanding. And he went with Barnabas, whose witness to the practical

side of Paul's case for a Gentile gospel would be most weighty with the apostles. But it is noteworthy that it is the grace of revelation or insight manifest in himself and his gospel (as fulfilment of the essence of the Prophets) on which he lays most stress in describing the impression produced on the Pillar apostles. He went to lay before them his gospel rather than its results (v. 2). Hence Barnabas at once drops out of account in this connexion. It was to Paul that no fresh suggestion was made (v. 6); it was he whom the apostles saw to be entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision (v. 7); and there is the same reference to the "inworking" and "grace" of God as manifest in Paul that meets us in his own words in Ephesians iii., where the reference is surely to tokens visible in himself and not to the results of his preaching.¹ All this points rather away from Acts xv. and towards an earlier date.

But if these combinations be provisionally accepted, they enable us to render a more rational account of the incident at Antioch which follows immediately in Galatians ii. 11-14. Many have found the vacillation of Peter unintelligible as following on the carefully considered solution of the problem of Jew and Gentile within the same Ecclesia of Christ.² The impulsive Peter may not have been quick-witted, as his apologists generally allege in his

¹ Dr. Sanday's words, "in both cases the argument which carried the day was the appeal of St. Paul to the hand of God *as seen in the success* of his own missions (Acts xv. 3, 4, 12, 26=Gal. ii. 7-9)," seem to me open to doubt. What reference there may be to grace visible in Paul's labours rather than in himself, is amply satisfied by the Antiochene work, of which Titus was probably a sample.

² McGiffert asserts that "the compact provided only for the distinct and separate existence of Jewish and Gentile Christianity, and did not contemplate their relation one to the other" (p. 206). I could admit this thesis only by excising Acts xv. 20, 21. When we recall that the Judaizers of Acts xv. 1 must have criticised the common meals between Jewish and Gentile Christians usual in Antioch, we feel that the subject must have come before Peter during the conference.

defence; but it is hard to believe that he came down to Antioch soon after all the troubles raised there and re-echoed in Jerusalem, touching the status of Gentile Christians, without having made up his mind to a policy in relation to the intercourse of Jewish and Gentile Christians. Personally, however, I cannot see the object of his coming down at all on the heels of Judas and Silas.¹ But surely he would have foreseen that his presence could only do harm if he was not quite clear on this issue. Further, Barnabas' action, if subsequent to the Jerusalem Conference of Acts xv., is even less defensible.

But is not a more natural solution possible? Suppose that Paul and Barnabas had followed up the earlier private visit of Galatians ii. 1-10 with a practical proof that they and their converts were indeed mindful of the poor, and those the poor of the mother-Church. What more likely than that Peter, with his quick feeling for that which was generous and brotherly, could not refrain from going to see face to face the men who had done this loving deed? And in what mood would he be more likely to go in practice beyond what he had carefully considered in all its consequences (especially for the future of his own work) than when fraternizing with men who had just acted so fraternally? In this light his subsequent rebound into the realm of ordinary Jewish thought, at least in relation to the expediency of preserving some distinction, does him far less discredit. In this way we can form a more kindly estimate of Barnabas also in the matter. Finally, we can explain the fact that the believing Jews, in spite of their more liberal feelings and previous practice, followed Peter's

¹ If Peter came down after the compact and caused such a crisis as Paul describes, I cannot see how Luke, whose source here seems complete and continuous, could write as he does in Acts xv. 32, 33; and after these verses there seems no time (during the "certain days" between v. 33 and v. 36) for Peter to come and for the unsettling effects of his visit to subside sufficiently for Paul to leave Antioch for a long mission

lead rather than Paul's. For they were of course ignorant of the private compact as to the Pauline gospel and as to the division of spheres between the two missions, which Peter's action was virtually transgressing by the moral compulsion it was putting on Gentile Christians. Had it been subsequent to Acts xv. and the comfortable words of Judas and Silas as to the attitude of the Jerusalem authorities, it is very doubtful whether they would have done the like.

Such then is our reading of Galatians ii. It has in its favour the fact that, like Ramsay's theory, it deals strictly with Paul's calm transition from the statement that "he remained unknown in person to the churches of Judæa" (which must include Jerusalem in particular, as his logic requires) to his words, "Next after an interval of fourteen years I went again up to Jerusalem." It has likewise the merit of placing the whole of chapters i.-ii. prior to the evangelization of the Galatians, as best satisfies the argument of the Apostle in the face of Judaizers in Galatia.

2. But if this be so, how is one to account for Paul's total silence in Galatians as to the Jerusalem Conference, which, whether as a signal triumph or as an ambiguous episode to be cleared up, could not be simply ignored? It is here that Ramsay fails to realize that his own argument excludes a date for the Epistle subsequent to Acts xv. If, however, it be not subsequent to the Jerusalem compact, we cannot admit a second visit to Galatia as implied in the Epistle, save on the hypothesis of an unrecorded visit very soon after the first. Does then the Epistle presuppose two visits? Several scholars have alleged that the exegesis of the Epistle does not require them; and this is my own view.

Lightfoot candidly recognises that in the words "I marvel that so quickly are ye turning renegades from Him

who called you in Christ's grace" (cf. v. 8), the interval must count from their first knowledge of the gospel. So that, even if a second visit intervened, the force of "so quickly" is not affected by it. But when he tries to water down that phrase itself by remarking that "quickness and slowness are relative terms"; and that relative to truths so momentous "a whole decade of years" might be regarded as a short period in which to change one's mind, one cannot but be conscious of a note of special pleading. Paul thinks of his converts as still immature "little children" in whom the Christ-life has in fact not yet taken definite embryonic shape; so that Paul has again to undergo, as it were, a mother's pangs in anxious and sympathetic imagination (iv. 19). And when we recollect that the transference of allegiance, as contemplated by the Galatians, was not from the Gospel to something other in nature, but only to a completed gospel, we should rather consider a year or so since their evangelization far nearer the mark as an outside limit for a marvellously speedy change of the sort. Hence we must insist on the full force of Paul's surprise at their inexperience in being "so speedily" moved by plausible words (cf. 2 Thess. ii. 2).

Nor can I see any reason to admit the existence of an unrecorded second visit prior to the writing of the Epistle. "Unrecorded," I say, because the visit in Acts xvi. seems quite excluded, for the reason that Paul could not have failed to make known to the Galatians in some form at least the decision of the Jerusalem conference, as Acts xvi. definitely asserts; and this would have taken away nearly all the force of the Judaizing insinuations in relation to the attitude of the apostles, especially as Silas had been at hand to corroborate what Paul had to say. To suppose that he had neglected to state the *principles*, too, upon which he had fought their cause of freedom at Jerusalem would be to suppose that he was not Paul, but some inferior

person altogether.¹ Hence the second visit, to meet the conditions, must (if not a mere figment) fall also before the Jerusalem Conference, and be one unrecorded in Acts. But is it implied at all in Galatians? Lightfoot answers affirmatively, denying that i. 9 ("As we have said before, so now again I say") is a solemn reiteration of i. 8: but on slender grounds. Nor has he noticed a grammatical argument on the other side, in the fact that whereas in v. 21 the reference to words spoken some time before (at the time of evangelization) is made by the aorist (*καθὼς προεῖπον*), in i. 9 we have the perfect (*ὥς προειρήκαμεν*), "I have already said," in contradistinction to "I said on that occasion."²

Again, if in i. 10 he turns to meet the charge that he is an unprincipled man, suiting his message to his hearers' wishes, this surely would have had its maximum plausibility early in his career, when he had been doing much preaching to Jews. And the same applies to v. 11., where he cries, "If I am still preaching circumcision"—in the sense meant by Judaizers, namely, as incumbent upon all—"why, then, am I the victim of persecution?"³ In that case the offensiveness of the Cross (as of a Redeemer "from the

¹ Ramsay, indeed, argues to the contrary effect, but unconvincingly. "Why," it may be asked, "is Galatians silent about the Jerusalem Concordat of Acts xv.?" He boldly replies that it, and the fact that Paul had communicated its resolutions to the Galatians on his second visit, had been already used against him in Galatia, as if he were "merely the messenger and subordinate of the Twelve." But, then, there was surely all the greater need for him to correct this version of the Conference and his relation to it, if such talk was current among his converts. It is contrary to the genius of the Epistle itself not to have met the insinuation fairly and squarely."

² This moreover is the only sense compatible with the present indicative (*εἰ τις ... εὐαγγελίζεται*), which, in contrast to the hypothetical subjunctive in verse 8, implies that he is now referring to some one actually engaged in preaching in this fashion, as he writes. This he cannot have said on his second visit; whereas, as an advance by way of emphasis on the hypothetical form of v. 8, it can be correlated with "as I have already seen," as well as with "so here and now I repeat."

³ i.e. "as you know me to have been at the hands of your Jewish neighbours." Paul's experiences at Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, seem to have left a deep mark on his mind (2 Tim. iii. 11; cf. Gal. vi. 17).

curse of the Law," ii. 19, iii. 13, vi. 12) vanishes. Such insinuations would soon cease to deceive even the Galatians, once Paul's distinctive labours in other Gentile centres became matter of common knowledge.

But what, it may be asked, of iv. 13? "I personally have never suffered any wrong at your hands. In fact ye are aware that it was a bodily infirmity that led to my preaching the gospel to you at the first." Does not this, at least, presuppose a second visit? Lightfoot, while admitting, on the analogy of John vi. 62, ix. 8, 1 Timothy i. 13 (of which 1 Tim. i. 13 is quite decisive), that "formerly" is a possible rendering of the adverbial phrase rendered "at the first" in A.V., and "the first (former) time" in R.V. (τὸ πρότερον), yet prefers the sense of R.V. in order to explain the emphasis of the expression where it stands. But this receives its best explanation in the fact that it is needed as a *qualifying* adverb to render what is said about Paul's having evangelized them *in consequence of a physical infirmity* strictly accurate. For though the beginning of his work among the Galatians (in Pisidian Antioch) was due to this circumstance, yet its continuance was due to other causes; and he had probably got over the effects of his malady long before reaching a large section of his converts. Hence the statement only becomes correct when "evangelization due to physical infirmity" is qualified by the addition of "at the first," "to begin with," "in the first instance," very much as in 1 Timothy i. 13.¹ In corroboration one may note an observation of Zahn, himself an upholder of the theory of a second visit; namely, that "evangelization" (εὐαγγελίζεσθαι) in New Testament usage means "bringing the message of salvation to those who do not yet know it, or have not yet received it." Hence it is a word that will not enter naturally into union with the sup-

¹ For there, too, τὸ πρότερον has a limited duration, namely the *short* period of his being a persecutor of Christians.

posed latent correlative to "on the former visit," namely, "the second time" (πάλιν or τὸ δεύτερον). Zahn himself evades this difficulty by supposing the evangelization to have reached the one region in two waves, as it were, corresponding to two distinct visits, the former alone being occasioned by physical infirmity. This has no support in Acts, and is not so plausible as McGiffert's suggestion that the journey from Antioch to Derbe counted as one occasion of evangelization, and the return journey as another. Nor does it really satisfy the passage. For one is left asking why Paul says nothing about the character of his reception on the second visit, so broadly hinted at on this showing. To refer to their consistency of attitude would surely have added much to the contrast drawn to the present attitude, which he pictures his letter as likely to discover in them.¹

On the whole, then, we see no good reason to distrust the first impression conveyed by the Apostle's almost incredulous surprise, expressed in his opening words, at the instability of his young converts. He writes in the accents of one who feels that his back was hardly turned before the children of whose impulsive affection he has had such recent and moving tokens allowed themselves to be fascinated by some inferior attraction. And with this agrees the final appeal to be spared further trouble from such trivial challenges as those echoed in the doubting hearts of his converts. For when he wrote "for I bear in my body the brand-marks of Jesus," was he not pointing to what was fresh in their memories and in his own, the suffering endured in doing the work of a faithful apostle, as implied and partly described in Acts xiii. 50-xiv. 22?² Quite prob-

¹ This is the sense in which Zahn takes v. 16, refusing to see in ὥστε ἐχθρὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ὑμῶν any reference to a second visit. The words echo an expression already applied to Paul by his Judaizing opponents in Galatia.

² "Does not this seem like the language of one who has lately passed through a fiery trial, and who, looking back upon it . . . while the recollection is still fresh upon him, sees in his late struggles a new consecration . . . and

ably those are right who see in the simple phrase "all the brethren who are with me" (i. 2) the description of a band of fellow-travellers; and an occasion on which this and the notable absence of reference to one or other of his Churches as joining in salutations would alike be natural, will be suggested in the sequel.

We are left, then, with the question as to the exact date and place of Galatians. Dr. Lightfoot has written at length to prove this Epistle later than those to the Corinthians. But he assumes what seems to me the false notion that terse, allusive, aphoristic references to a subject precede the explicit and argumentative treatment of the same. To many, on the contrary, the confident *obiter dicta* of Corinthians on the Law and Circumcision¹ will appear as the tokens of a victory already won and put beyond direct challenge. At any rate, recent writers like Zahn and McGiffert agree from different standpoints in upholding the conclusion that Galatians is actually the earliest of Paul's extant epistles. But when we ask how long before the Thessalonian Epistles it was written, they begin to differ. Zahn assigns it to the early months of Paul's first European mission, say during his stay at Thessalonica. McGiffert, on the other hand, denies that any point in this journey is possible.² For "if Paul saw the Galatian Christians during the interval that elapsed between the Conference at Jerusalem and the writing of his Epistle, it is exceedingly difficult to understand why he should be obliged to give them in his letter so full an account of that conference [yet saying so much, he should have said

an additional seal set upon his apostolic authority?" How aptly these words of Lightfoot suit the situation soon after his first visit to Galatia! far more so than that presupposed in 2 Cor. i. 3-11, which would not be before the minds of his readers.

¹ e.g. 1 Cor. vii. 18 f. (Gal. v. 2, 6, vi. 15); xv. 56; and for Justification 1 Cor. i. 30, iv. 4, vi. 11; 2 Cor. iii. 9, v. 19-21.

² *History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age*, p. 227.

more] and of the events that followed. It seems clear that in Galatians ii. Paul is telling his readers of events about which they had before heard nothing, at any rate from him." But this could hardly have been the case after his second visit, recorded in Acts xvi. 4 f. Such an argument tells heavily against Zahn, who identifies the visit of Galatians ii. 1-10 with that of Acts xv. When, however, McGiffert goes on to infer that the Epistle was written at Antioch on the eve of Paul's second mission, he falls victim to the counter-criticism that Galatians iv. 20 ("Yea, I would that I could be present with you at this very moment, and change my present tone; for I am perplexed about you") expresses an *impotent* wish to go straightway to them, instead of writing. Had he in fact been on the eve of going in person, he must have hinted at his intentions, to say the least.

Thus, on the theory that Galatians ii. agrees with Acts xv. —beset with difficulties as the theory itself is—there seems no intelligible stage in the second missionary journey, from its inception to its close, at which we can imagine Paul sitting down to write the Epistle; while a date later than that journey seems ruled out by the fact that the rapidity of the Galatians' change from the state in which their conversion left them called forth the writer's indignant surprise. Ramsay, indeed, argues that Galatians was written at Antioch in the summer of 53, on the eve of the third journey. But his evasion of the plain fact, as Lightfoot rightly regards it, that it is from the date of their call by God, *i.e.* his first visit, that their rapid defection is reckoned, is not successful; while the answers he suggests to the query, "Why did Paul not start at once himself?" does not here suffice any more than if one assumes the situation advocated by McGiffert. There is point, however, in his turning on the objector and asking, "Why Paul did not make some explanatory statement of

the reasons that compelled him 'at such a crisis to be content with a letter, and to do without a visit?' And the true reply must be, that the reason was of so obvious or notorious a nature that he could safely leave it to the messenger (the one probably who had brought the news from Galatia) to report in his own words to the Galatians. Such a reason, adequate to explain both the silence and the expressed inability to come forthwith, would lie in the nature of the case, if the news found Paul already involved in the Judaistic controversy nearer home, in Antioch, or already on his way up to Jerusalem to fight the battle of Christian freedom. If this was the case, then the Epistle would fall somewhere between the latter part of 48 (49) and the beginning of 49 (50) A.D., according to the time one allows for the first journey, begun early in 47, and for Paul's stay at Antioch between the two journeys.

The foregoing theory as a whole appears to me to correlate more known facts than any other. If it involves latent fallacies, their detection will probably advance the problems at least a little.

3. Several conclusions attach themselves as corollaries to this discussion.

First, and most obviously, comes the literary corollary, already probable from his ignorance of Paul's retirement into Arabia, that the author of Acts did not use Galatians among his sources.

Next the chronological consequences, the chief of which is a very early date for Paul's conversion. Putting the second visit between 43-46, viz., before the Famine of 46-47, we get two approximate dates. Reckoning back thirteen years, as involved in Galatians ii. 1, we get 30-33; reckoning fifteen—the alternative reached by adding the two years before the first visit—we arrive at the period between 28 and 31, *i.e.*, at latest within two years and a half of Pentecost. Against the latter reckoning, save for 30-31,

there are strong objections; and we are glad to see that Ramsay is very emphatic in preferring the former reading of Galatians ii. 1 as best according with the central significance of the Conversion in the argument.¹ And so we regard 30-33 A.D. as its probable date.

Thirdly, the general effect is to minimize the difference between the attitude of the leading apostles towards the reception of uncircumcised Gentiles and that of Paul himself. A common understanding, based on the coexistence of two branches in the one Ecclesia—if with a certain superiority attaching to the Jewish type in the older apostles' minds—seems to have arisen early; their chief anxiety being to secure a similar type of piety or of religious and ethical feeling. This was certainly the case at the time when the "four abstinences" were laid down at the Jerusalem Concordat. On another occasion we shall try to show that it was so some four years earlier.

VERNON BARTLET.

THE DOCTRINES OF GRACE.

VIII.

SANCTIFICATION.

ACCORDING to the Catholic faith, the religious life has one supreme moment never to be repeated nor annulled, and afterwards it has a varied history whose chapters often repeat themselves, and sometimes annul one another. The conscious moment occurs when one who has been frivolous, unbelieving, and worldly is arrested and bethinks himself, when the mist rolls away in which he has been walking as in a vain show, and he sees the austere and beautiful reality of the spiritual world,—when he is moved by a sudden and irresistible influence to reverse his course and to

¹ EXPOSITOR, July, 1898.

fling himself with utter abandonment into a new and undreamt of future. The veil may be lifted by a book, or by a picture, or by a conversation, or by a silence, as it most commonly is lifted by the gospel declared in Holy Scripture or in public preaching. The effect is vision, conversion (and regeneration). The history begins when a man who has come to himself and to God sets himself to cultivate the religious life under the guidance and the grace of the Holy Ghost. And his progress from that day in knowledge and in holiness is sanctification.

As sanctification is the recreation of the soul in a nobler shape, its first necessity is a *Perfect Type*, and this type is Christ Jesus. Within the recesses of our mind we have got an idea of physical beauty which the ordinary person is neither able to describe nor to draw. It is an endowment of which he is not always conscious, a piece of property which he has not yet possessed. One day he enters a gallery and stands before the Venus of Milo or the Apollo Belvidere. In that instant he is conscious of his ideal, and has recognised that perfection which all along has been in his mind. After the same fashion we have in our soul an ideal of spiritual beauty which we could not place upon paper, and to which we ourselves have never attained. Occasionally it is dimly thrown out before us in the life of a friend; we recognise nobility of which we have dreamed, incarnate in this man. No one, however, has exhibited in his character the absolute perfection that our souls seek after, and would desire to see. Every good man in Holy Scripture or in history is a hint of the supreme Goodness, an inspiration for our imagination, a prophecy of a coming revelation. As the worthies of the Bible pass before us, each one at once attracts and disappoints us, because there is in him some trait of goodness, in him also some grave defect. Moses and David, Samuel and Jonathan, Isaiah and Jeremiah, amaze us in

turn by their moral vision, their spiritual poetry, their chivalrous heroism, their strong integrity, their gracious words, their patient suffering. They also leave us dissatisfied by their human faults and glaring imperfection. They themselves look forward to a day which is to come, and imagine a Face which shall satisfy the soul. Isaiah, in his 53rd chapter, and David, in the 72nd Psalm, with eager, reverent mind, depict the Man which is to be, and bid men wait for His coming. With less than this Man they may not be content; when this Man appears, nothing will remain to be desired. Throughout the world, in sacred literature and also in secular, scattered fragments of a perfect figure can be found, and then when Christ appeared it was discovered. According to universal opinion, from which there is no dissension, and never indeed can be, Jesus fulfils our ideal of the Perfect Man.

It were possible to imagine a human type which would be perfect but provincial; it is a part of Christ's excellence that His perfection is universal. The son of a Jewish maiden, we do not think of Him as a Jew; He is a Man representing the human race. Born in the first century, we do not speak of Him as a Man of His time, because He is a Man of all time. Living within the circumstances of a narrow life, we do not think of Him as a carpenter or as a rabbi. We think of Him as above all circumstances and doing everlasting work. We should find it impossible to describe His character, because we should have to include every single high quality, and to state them at their highest point. One hardly limits Him to manhood, because one feels that in Him was also combined the excellency of the other sex, so that man and woman meet and are harmonized in Him. His character is not one of the colours into which light is split, He is rather Light itself, which gives its tint to every flower, to the sea, and to the sky. For all men, therefore, and all women, of every nation and

of every age, and of every condition, He is the pattern of perfection.

His elevation above the limitations of His time and nation make Him an eternal type. Pictures even of the great masters have their vogue, coming into favour, and going out of favour, like a fashion. The picture indeed remains the same, but our idea of what we want and of what we admire changes. This picture only is not subject to the caprice of moral fashion, since the only change is in its growing appreciation and its deeper understanding. There have been many schools in Christianity, but all of them have adored Christ. There have been many schools of unbelief, but none of them, save the most unworthy, have dared to criticise Christ. He is new in every age, and He belongs to every age, and with every age He is more certainly accepted as the brightness of humanity.

Against Christ, however, as the type of the soul it may be urged that He is too high and is lifted beyond our attainment. Is it not a disability in our Christian faith that it should propose unto every Christian, however imperfect, the imitation of Jesus, and insist that he shall never be content till he is like his Lord? If this be a fault, it is a fault of nobility, and not of poverty. What finer tribute could be paid to any religion than this, that it will look at nothing but the ideal of perfection, and never rest till that be realized in the life of its humblest member? It is better to fail aiming at the highest than to succeed aiming at the lowest; and in the distant perfection of Christ is the inspiration of the Christian life. For St. John and for St. Paul it was the joy of their hearts that they had never reached unto the height of Jesus, although they had ever been climbing, and that with every year to come there would open out to them unimagined summits of holiness, so that they would still be only drawing nearer to Christ, whom no man could overtake on this

side of the grave. It is the very penalty and promise of our life that with us everything approximates, but never touches, perfection. No one has ever seen a straight line ; it is but a form of speech, or a unit of calculation. All that we see, all that we feel, are but essays at absolute beauty, truth, and love. What we see is higher than what we do, what we imagine is more than we see, and yet there remaineth what has not entered into the heart of man. The glory of Christian sanctification is twofold : that we never can in this world rise to the perfection of Christ, but that we may ever be growing into His likeness from youth to old age.

If the first word in sanctification be *Perfection*, the second is *Revelation*, for this perfection must be shown unto our eyes, and it has been so made manifest in the mirror of the gospel. For a moment one had desired a grander medium, and had been inclined to ask that the character of Jesus should have been made known to us by the mind of angels, or by the trained thinkers of the human race. The next moment one sees his mistake, and is thankful for the biographers of Jesus. What was required in this case was not exposition by supernatural intellect or by great genius, but simply honest and loyal minds which would hold up the glass to the life and person of the Lord. It had been an unspeakable misfortune if, instead of the simple annals of the gospel, we had had learned studies of Jesus' life. We had then seen the Master as men imagined Him, tricked out with their dainty phrases and tawdry tributes of respect. As it is we see the Master as He spoke and as He worked before men who did not understand Him and could not then appreciate Him, but who loved Him and reflected Him in their love. We may be certain as we read the Gospels that we are looking on the Face of Christ, and that we know what He was and what He is.

For this revelation the Gospels are absolutely necessary,

and can never be superseded; for although the Christian may come to know Christ in his heart, he can never afford to lose Christ in the Gospels. It is there that we first see Him, and it is there that we first understand Him. We had never known the Christ of the heavenly places unless we had known the Christ of Galilee, and we only know to-day what the Christ of the heavenly places is because we know what the Christ of Galilee was. It is best that every disciple should have the likeness of the Lord hanging upon the inner wall of his heart, but it is necessary that he should ever verify that likeness by the one which he possesses in the four Gospels. Had we not the authoritative portrait of the Gospels, as time went on strange likenesses of Christ might be created and come into fashion, and Christians be formed after a type which would be no longer the character of Jesus Christ, but the creation of a later age. There has been such a thing as an unreal and fantastic Christ, who has been preached and held up for imitation, and against this false and dangerous mysticism there is no check or remedy save the face of Christ in the mirror of the gospel.

Among the various guides to sanctification the most reliable and effectual is the Life of Christ; because, while every other is local and represents a school, this book contains the length and breadth of Christian perfection. A Puritan is satisfied with the *Pilgrim's Progress*, and a Roman with the *Imitation of Christ*; and each may appreciate up to a certain degree the school of the other, but both find themselves at one in the Gospels. If, however, the Gospels are to have their due effect, and one is to see in their pages the very face of Jesus, he must come without prejudice and without preconceptions—in fact, as St. Paul would say, “with unveiled face.” There is a constant danger that one should have made up his mind as to what Jesus ought to do and what Jesus ought to say,

and then to readjust the whole Life of Jesus, with subtle interpretations and artificial glosses, to fit in with his own mind. An ingenuous faith will accept the Lord as he appears in the picture of the Evangelists, being prepared for any surprises of goodness, and being always convinced that Jesus' Life is Life in Excelsis. Especially is it dangerous to lay down in one's mind any principles about the miraculous, and to take it for granted, as a modern person is apt to do, that the miraculous is impossible. Nothing can be impossible with Jesus, who has brought the power and grace of Deity within the narrow circumstances of human life. Far more wonderful than the healing of lepers and the raising of the dead is His own personal life, with its air of Heaven, its unfailing resources of grace, its irresistible influence upon human character. One reason for limited and provincial Christianity, a Christianity with narrow vision and one-sided character, is that Christians have gone to learn holiness everywhere except in the Gospels. The condition of a rich and full Christianity will be the study of the Divine and perfect life revealed to us by the Evangelists, and allowed to have its unfettered play upon our own souls and lives.

The third principle in the doctrine of sanctification is *Contemplation*, and it would be wise for Christians to remind themselves constantly that there are two methods by which any person can become like another, just as there are two methods by which an artist can be the disciple of a great master. We may set ourselves with care and perseverance to reproduce our friend's manner, to echo his tone of voice, and to repeat his actions in detail. We can attain such skill in this study that strangers will be irresistibly reminded of our hero by our pronunciation of a word, or by a sudden gesture, or by the repetition of an idea. This is imitation, a method which is sanctioned in Art as often as a pupil copies from a picture, sanctioned

also in literature as often as a student masters a great writer's style, and sanctioned in life with frequent good results as often as a young person follows exactly in the steps of a good man.

There is, however, another method, which is more spontaneous and more effectual, wherein one simply lives as much as he can in his friend's company, and leaves his mind open to his influence, and braces himself to seek after the same ends. Gradually, and without conscious effort, the poorer nature changes into the likeness of the higher, so that every person can recognise that a change has taken place, and that it has been a regeneration; but the change is recognised, not by sound of voice or trick of manner, but by the spirit of the life and the new shape of the soul. The subject of this change will have no self-consciousness, and will not know that his face is shining; he will rather be more painfully convinced than ever of his unlikeness to the friend whom he reveres, while all the world has seen him approximating to that likeness every day. This method is contemplation, which is not to imitate but to behold Christ.

Contemplation has two advantages over imitation, and the first is inwardness, for he that contemplates knows Christ better than he who imitates. One person may set himself to study a picture, reading what he can find about the age and school, about the drawing and colour of the work, till he could give its description and its history. Another may sit alone with that picture, without a book and without a note, for the same space of time, and allow the picture to imprint itself upon his soul. The former could write the story of the picture, the latter possesses the picture in the spirit. The saint is not simply a man who could relate the biography of Christ from end to end, and at every turn could discover a rule for his daily actions, till the Life of the Lord had passed into dates and regulations.

He is rather a man who has been overcome by the excellent beauty of the Lord's face, and has spent his time in admiration, so that afterwards the reflection of that beauty still lingers on his own character and life. Contemplation also has this advantage, that it never suggests the bondage of conscious Art, but always allows the perfect freedom of the soul. There is a vast distinction between one who copies a master and one who belongs to the school of the master. The copy of a picture is exact in details, and may often be rendered with great skill ; but it remains even in the case of the most pious copyist a representation of alien work. The disciple does not copy any of the master's work, but he paints in the master's spirit. His subject may be different from any which the master has chosen, but his treatment of the subject will be after the master's mind, so that you do not say, This is what the master first did, but This is how that master would have done. He has retained his own individuality, and has done more homage to the master.

It seems an excellent rule to say what Jesus says, and do what Jesus did ; but this is really a mechanical idea of sanctification, and would keep the disciple of Jesus in bondage all his days. Between the details of Jesus' life and of our own there is the difference between the east and the west, the difference between the first century and the nineteenth, the difference between two civilizations. One dares to say that there are words of Jesus which, as they stand, we could not use, and works of Jesus which we ought not to do. It is not for us to reproduce the form of Galilean life, nor even to draw too close an analogy between its circumstances and our environment. It is ours to catch the spirit of the Lord and to enter into His mind, so that the love and righteousness which inspire every word and deed of Christ may pass as a subtle essence into the body of our daily life. And so it will come to pass that in our

modern life Jesus Himself will live afresh, and we shall bring Him nearer to a faithless world.

Another principle of sanctification is *Progression*, which means that we cannot grow into the likeness of the Lord in a brief space, but that we must advance from stage to stage. It is unfortunate for plain people who do not care for argument or nice distinctions that there has been so much trouble made over the idea of Christian perfection. It is exasperating, on the one hand, that a believer in Jesus Christ should almost resent the suggestion that he can overcome his sins and trample them under foot; and it becomes an irony when, on occasion, he will refuse to sing the words at the end of the *Te Deum*, that God would keep us this day from sin, upon the ground that this is impossible, and is foolhardy to ask. Does it prove inevitable shallowness of character and a vain mind to believe that we can rid ourselves of sin in the fellowship of Jesus Christ? and is it an example of humility, and even of reverence for the Lord, that we should groan all our days under this body of death? Can no Christian say with truth, "Thanks be unto God who has given me the victory"? and if he says so, is he of necessity a weakling or a boaster? It is also only less trying to be told that certain people have come to perfection and are no longer conscious of sin; and the irony is still keener in this case when they alone have perceived their own perfection, and any one of their neighbours could point out their sins. Can the recreation of the soul be so rapid and slight an achievement? Can the height of Christian character be so easily and surely climbed? This perfection must be on a very narrow and poverty-stricken scale—the scale not of an oak which groweth slowly to its majestic proportions, but of a gourd which cometh up in a night. What occurs to the plain person who has no theory, but is only possessed with an overwhelming idea of the excellence of Christ, is that sanctification will advance on a

series of levels, one rising above the other. Each level, as we look at it from below and toil to reach it, will seem perfection, because it is the complete face of Christ as we have seen it from our standpoint. When we have completed a fresh ascent, our vision will have grown; we shall then discover fresh imperfection in ourselves and unsuspected beauty in Christ. Again we shall be inspired with adoration, again we shall be smitten with dissatisfaction—adoration of the new glory, dissatisfaction with our own defects. We shall brace ourselves for another ascent, which is to be the last; and again we shall be disappointed with that disappointment wherein are mixed both joy and sorrow. It has been said that the final ascent will be the hour of death, and that then the soul will pass altogether into the likeness of the Lord; but on this point Catholic doctrine has not agreed, and the Christian reason must have her own difficulty. One believes that deliverance from the body and the open vision of the Lord will strike dead within us the remains of sin, both the desire and the habit. One hopes also that the first day of the heavenly life will only be the beginning of another progress which shall know no end, wherein with every age we shall again ascend, following the Lamb whithersoever He goeth, while He ever moves before us in new revelations of holiness.

The last great word in this doctrine is *Inspiration*, without which indeed there could be no hope of sanctification. Between formal and real holiness the difference really is that the one is of the Spirit of God, and the other is of the will of man. It is possible by sheer force of will to abandon certain sins and to copy certain virtues; by sheer force of will to walk at a distance in the steps of Christ, and to approximate to the outer form of His life. This is a laborious effort without beauty and without fruit—a carved tree, not a living plant. Growing and fruitful holiness is the outcome of Jesus' spirit living and working within the

soul. It matters not how much the student may love the master's work, or how patiently he may reproduce it on the canvas, there will ever be something which cannot be designed, present in the original picture and absent in the reproduction. Were the master to stand beside the pupil and ply him with rules, were he even to take his hand and guide it in the stroke, it would not avail. One thing only would serve, that the very spirit of the master should pass into his pupil, till he saw with his master's eye and wrought with his master's hand, till he was lost and absorbed in his master. While Jesus was with His disciples they were pupils in His school, and we envy them their privilege. He pointed out their faults, and showed them what they ought to have done, and yet they failed, and came short in almost every point of the religious life. By-and-by He passed from sight, and then He returned as a spiritual influence to speak not in their ears but in their souls, to guide not their lives but their minds. They were not now simply instructed—they were also inspired, and inspiration is as much beyond instruction as the soul is more than the body. It has frequently happened that a husband and wife have lived together for a quarter of a century, and the husband has been filled with devotion and admiration; but it was after his wife departed, and was now a spiritual presence in his heart, that he began to think and to live so exactly after her model that the world noticed the change, and were reminded at every turn of her who, unseen, was still living. The vision of perfection would not avail the Christian soul without the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, by which that vision is indeed afforded, and by which it is turned into reality. For the soul is like the sensitive film, and the Lord in the Gospels is the perfect beauty; but the medium of reproduction, without which all would be vain, is the light of the sun, and the light of the sun is the Holy Spirit of the Lord.

JOHN WATSON.

APOCALYPTIC SKETCHES.

IX.

THE MARRIAGE SUPPER OF THE LAMB.

REV. XIX.

WE are here confronted with another of those impressive contrasts with which the Apocalypse abounds. The wail over fallen Babylon of the princes and merchants and sailors has scarcely died away from earth when from heaven above there are heard triumphant shouts of victory. The "alas!" of the world is replaced by the "Alleluia" of heaven, in chorus after chorus of praise to Him who has overthrown selfishness and sin, and given the victory to purity and love.

We are now to witness a triple triumph over a triple foe. Recall the great foes of Christ and His people which have in the course of these visions been described in full. There was first the great red dragon of chapter xii., symbol, as we are distinctly told, of the Prince of Darkness, called in chapter xx. "that old serpent the devil." Next, in chapter xiii., a full description was given of the "beast coming up out of the sea," followed by "another beast coming up out of the land." As the first great enemy was the devil, this second enemy is the world, in its ferocious cruelty as represented by the one beast, in its deceitfulness, as represented by the other which had horns like a lamb but spake like a dragon. After the dragon of chapter xii., and the beasts of chapter xiii., we have the woman of chapter xvii., whose description we had so fully before us in the last article that we need not recall it. The first enemy being the devil, the second the world, we may without hesitation, leaving out the specific applications with which we dealt last month, think of this third one in the abstract as the flesh.

Such is the trinity of evil with which Christ and His people have to contend. And these three are one. In the last chapter the woman was riding on the beast, and the two were treated as one and named as one, "Babylon the great"; and in chapter xiii. we are told that the dragon gave his power and authority to the beast. From this it follows that in the last chapter we really had all the three in the one symbol, for though the dragon could not be separately distinguished, it was under his inspiration and control that the woman plied her seductive arts, and the beast put forth his destructive energy; and, indeed, we may consider that even this appeared in the symbol as represented by the scarlet colour; for the dragon, it will be remembered, was red. The beast, on his first appearance, was probably black; but in chapter xvii. it has become a scarlet-coloured beast, and the woman, too, is clothed in scarlet. They are both "clothed upon," as it were, with the great red dragon, in striking antithesis to the woman clothed with the sun. Thus we may regard Babylon the Great as a combination of the three great enemies of God and His people, and the fall of Babylon as the overthrow of the entire trinity of evil.

When the scene is shifted to heaven, we see the same triumph, but over each separately; first over the woman, followed by the coming forth of the pure bride to enter on the holy joy of her heavenly marriage (xix. 1-10); next over the beast and the false prophet (as the second beast is here called, to bring out specially the quality of deceitfulness which in the symbol had been indicated by the horns like a lamb), the rider on the white horse, whom we recognise at the opening of the first seal as the "Son of God gone forth to war" returning from the fight a Conqueror, crowned with many diadems (xix. 11-21); and, finally, there is the crowning triumph over the dragon, the last and mightiest enemy of all, followed by the renewal

of the face of nature, the end of sin and death and tears, and the coming down from heaven of the glorious city of God (xx.-xxii.).

The order, observe, is the reverse of the order of their introduction: the first is last, and the last first. The reason of this is not far to seek. In the trinity of evil Satan comes first as the original tempter, and the wily foe behind the scenes in all temptation. But as he is spirit, and therefore invisible and intangible, in order to get power over men, he must act through flesh and blood and things material. He must make use of the world as the engine alike of his cruelty and his cunning. And as the female form is the highest expression in nature of beauty and attractiveness, we have a woman as the appropriate symbol of Satan's masterpiece. By capturing the female figure he transforms himself into "an angel of light." He himself is of hell, the world is of earth, the woman is of heaven; and as the corruption of the best is the very worst, it comes about that the most refined and loveliest work of God becomes, when possessed with Satan, his most seductive and destructive minister. Thus, in the attack the woman is conspicuous, the great attraction, but she has the world at her back, for she is riding on the beast, and Satan is unseen, betrayed only by the scarlet colour; and accordingly, in the celebration of the victory in heaven, we are summoned to witness in three successive scenes the overthrow first of the woman, then of the beast, and last of the dragon. Hence the order in the heavenly triumph on the consideration of which we enter now:

The triumph song over the defeat of the woman is a magnificent hallelujah chorus. There is first the shout of the vast multitude of the hosts of heaven as the noise of many waters, yet with articulation so distinct that every word is heard: "Salvation and glory and power belong

unto our God." This dies down; and a second time the great hallelujah is sent rolling through the vault of heaven. Then the theme is taken up by the inner choir of the twenty-four elders and the four living creatures. Out of the silence which follows this strain comes a single voice, like the voice of the Son of God Himself, for it comes forth from the throne, calling upon all, small and great, to join the song; and then there is the final outburst from the great multitude in that short strong anthem which the genius of Handel has made to echo and re-echo through the corridors of time: "Alleluia; for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth."

We can now readily see how appropriate it is that the overthrow of the impure woman should be followed by the coming forth of the pure bride of God to be united for ever to Him in whom she finds all her nature craves of love and life and joy. The worshipping throng, even as they sing their anthem of praise, begin to make high preparation for a heavenly bridal. The adoration of heaven passes, by the most natural transition, into the joy of a wedding feast, a joy so truly human that the heaven of the Apocalypse loses all that distance and strangeness, not to say awfulness, which its transcendent glories, and the terrible thunders and lightnings and voices which have proceeded from it, have impressed upon our imagination. Every cloud has now cleared away, the last thunder is hushed into silence, and instead of forked lightning we have only pure and heavenly light, while in the full sunshine of the Divine presence the happy throng continue their glad chorus of thanksgiving and praise: "Let us rejoice and be exceeding glad, let us give the glory unto Him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and His wife has made herself ready."

This is no new figure of speech. It is found in the Old Testament prophets. In the New, John the Baptist takes

it up, and Christ Himself makes it emphatically His own. It is plain, then, that this vision of a wedding feast in heaven is no dream of a lonely mystic, but a distinct and prominent part of the revelation of Jesus Christ the Son of God. Without authority the conception would have been too daring for even a poet's imagination, so we have a little episode to assure us that it is no mere vision, that we can fully rely upon the representation as giving, so far as human thought can, a true idea of the joy of heaven. First there is a special summons to write it (verse 9). He had a general commission to write all that he saw and heard; but when special attention is to be called to some cheering announcement, there is a special summons to write, as it were to underscore or capitalize it. There are three occasions on which this is done. One we have had already when the voice from heaven said, "Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord." Another is coming when the great announcement is made, "Behold, I make all things new. And He said unto me, Write; for these words are true and faithful." So here we have the special summons: "Write, Blessed are they that are bidden unto the marriage supper of the Lamb."

Not only have we this special summons to put on record the great prospect, but a special assurance following it: "And he said unto me, These are the true words of God." When we think how transporting to the Apostle of Love must have been the thought of the heavenly marriage, the thought on the one hand of God over all, blessed for ever, ready to take His people into such close and endearing relations to Himself; and on the other hand of the people so purified from all iniquity, so utterly without spot or stain, that such a relation was even conceivable—when we allow ourselves to dwell on the transcendent thoughts which must have filled his soul before this great unveiling of the secrets of the future life, we can understand the feeling

which prompted him to fall down and worship Him who gave him the assurance that all was veritably true, and how it needed the protest of the angel, and the explanation that he was only an Apostle of good tidings like himself to turn his thoughts from the messenger to the message, and above all to Him concerning whom the message is given : " Worship God ; for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy."

In the latter part of the chapter we have the coming forth of the bridegroom as a conqueror returning from the war, having overthrown the great army that had been arrayed against him and had thirsted for the blood of his bride. Moreover, as the former scene culminated in a marriage feast, this reaches its climax in a banquet which is as gruesome in its horror as the other was rapturous in its joy.

As this would be too painful a subject to close with, it may be well to take it now. And first it is important to remember that in such representations as these we are confronted not with individual persons, but with abstractions clothed for the purpose of dramatic impressiveness with the attributes of personality. Moreover, the ideas embodied in the persons of the Apocalypse are often, from the necessity of the case, the extremes of contrast. To make this clear, let us go back to the two women who have figured so largely in the last six chapters. The woman clothed with the sun is the ideal Church, and the Scarlet Woman is her extreme antithesis. In actual life there are none so heavenly as the sun-clad woman, and scarcely any so utterly diabolical as the Scarlet Woman. Yet the representation, as a representation in the ideal, is no exaggeration ; for those who make the purity of heaven and of God their high ideal are ever tending in that direction, and will one day be clothed as with the light of heaven ; while those who turn away and yield to the seductions of the flesh, and

the world, and the devil, tend towards the character of the Scarlet Woman, and will in the end fall in her ruin. These two contrasted symbols, therefore, are the two poles of the moral universe: the marriage feast of heaven, the carrion banquet of hell. It is therefore not only contrary to all right principles of interpretation to apply the awful imagery of the close of this chapter to anything in history, but it introduces an element of difficulty which quite needlessly calls forth a protest from the thoughtful reader. Who could have borne Dante's *Inferno* if it had been taken as plain history? Its horrors would have been intolerable. But when it is taken as a poetic representation of the awful results of sin, the effect is entirely different. So here, when you have an angel of light standing in the sun and calling on the eagles and the vultures, and all the flesh-devouring birds of heaven, to gather together for a great banquet, and then down below are shown an immense plain strewn with corpses of kings, and captains, and mighty men, and all kinds of men, free and bond, small and great,—a great supper for the carrion birds,—it would be too horrible to allow the mind to turn to, even for a moment, were it not that it is evidently intended to set before the readers of this book, in the most forceful and memorable way possible, the awful results of yielding to the beast in us. As things are presented to us in every-day life, there is such a blending and intermingling of good and bad, of light and darkness, of angel and devil, that we are in terrible danger of being lured to our destruction by not seeing where we are going. There is a young man drinking his champagne with a light heart. Surely champagne is a good gift of God; and there is nothing wrong in festivity—is not heaven itself to be festivity? All very well, so long as the latent beast is not aroused. But let it be aroused, let the man yield to the temptations which beset him, and in a few years what is he? Carrion. “He that soweth to the flesh shall of the

flesh reap corruption." Put that awful certainty into the language of the imagination, and you have that frightful carrion supper of the vultures which makes the flesh creep, as one reads this terrible delineation of the sinner's doom. It is indeed a part of the shout of victory, for the beast and the false prophet by whom his victims were lured to their destruction are cast into the lake of fire, to be utterly destroyed for ever; but with the satisfaction of victory there is necessarily associated the sad and awful thought that those who identify themselves with the beast, and are marked indelibly as his, must share his awful fate.

Observe further the indications that the war is no mere war of carnage, but a holy war, fought not with carnal but with spiritual weapons; for, as we shall see later on, the only weapon is the Word; the sword proceeds out of the *mouth* of the Lord, and His followers are unarmed, their only accoutrements being fine linen white and pure. What carnage there may be in the contest, then, is not His doing or theirs, but the result of the evil passions which are let loose among the followers of the beast. He is no more responsible for the horrors of the vultures' banquet than were the heralds of freedom in the great American War of Slave Emancipation for the horrors with which it was necessary that that great act of righteousness should be carried out; and in this connection it is interesting to notice that the passage before us (see especially v. 15) seems to be the inspiration of that splendid ode which is known as "the battle hymn of the Republic":—

Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord:
He is trampling out the vintage where the grapes of earth are
stored;
He hath loosed the fateful lightning of His terrible swift sword.
His truth is marching on.

We have dwelt long enough on the gloomy background of the picture. Let us now look at the high lights of the fore-

ground. The whole scene is set forth with a Rembrandt-like antithesis of light and shade; and the shadows are there not for themselves alone, but for the sake of the central figures, which must now engage our attention.

“And I saw the heaven opened; and, behold, a white horse, and He that sat thereon called Faithful and True: and in righteousness He doth judge and make war” (v. 11). We have seen the rider on the white horse before—only once, however, at the very opening of this long series of seals, trumpets, thunders, vials. At the opening of the first seal (vi. 2), when the first of the four living creatures called, “Come,” “behold, a white horse, and He that sat thereon had a bow; and there was given unto Him a crown, and He came forth conquering and to conquer,”—*conquering*, for already the victory was gained in His own person; it is the risen Christ, already Victor over death and hell, who rides forth conquering, a crown upon His head. But it is only the beginning of a long war; for as yet He is alone, and the victory gained in His lonely duel with the Prince of Evil must be gained anew in all His followers till He can bring them with Him, a victorious army, all kings and priests to God. Accordingly it is written there that He comes forth “conquering *and to conquer*.” So the war goes on; and the rider on the white horse retires from view; for through all the holy war the Captain of our salvation is unseen. He is never absent, but He remains invisible, till the great day of His appearing, when behold again we see the Rider on the white horse, no longer alone, but attended with a mighty host: “The armies which are in heaven followed Him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen white and pure” (v. 14).

It will have been observed that when the Lord appears in any of the visions His name is never mentioned; but the descriptions given are such as plainly to mark Him out. This is quite in harmony with the apocalyptic nature of the

book, the revelation being addressed mainly to the eye. Even in the great unveiling of the first chapter, when the Lord appeared in glory to His servant John, the name is not mentioned : " In the midst of the seven golden candlesticks I saw one like unto a Son of Man " ; and then follows the marvellous description with which we are familiar. In the same way John here simply tells what he saw and what he heard, and yet makes it perfectly plain Who it is, some of the features being precisely the same as arrested his attention when first the heaven was opened and the Lord appeared. He is no longer indeed vested as a priest. He is now robed as a King ; but the features are the same : the eyes are a flame of fire, and out of the mouth proceeds a sharp sword, as in the first appearance.

And notice here in passing that His weapon is the sword of His mouth ; and that His followers are all unarmed, clad in fine linen white and pure, from which we see that this is no ordinary war, that it is a spiritual contest with spiritual weapons, so that we must interpret the dreadful imagery which follows in no offensive literal sense, but in the strong spiritual sense which we have already attempted to set forth.

It would seem that as He rides forth among the heavenly host He is greeted with shouts of " Faithful and True." Remember He had been out of sight of His people all through these cruel wars ; and again and again it had seemed as if His word had been broken and His promises had failed. Again and again had the lamentable cry gone up to heaven, " How long, O Master, the holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth ? " It had been an age-long trial of faith and patience ; but the faith was not misplaced, and the patience could not be disappointed ; and accordingly, when He rides forth in triumph with His redeemed behind Him, there rises from all around the shout, " Faithful and True."

There was, as we have seen, quite enough of the old features to make it certain who He was; but there are some new things in the picture which we must now look at. One of them is the garment sprinkled with blood. There is no blood on His followers' robes: they are all clothed in fine linen white and pure.

Must Jesus bear the cross alone,
And all the world go free?

Nay. Yet in one sense He did bear the cross alone, in that He was wounded for our transgressions. There is where the bloodstains came from. And the fact that there are none on His followers' robes proves that the reference cannot be to the blood of the enemies, but to His own. As the Lamb in the midst of the throne is a "Lamb as it had been slain," so the Rider on the white horse is arrayed in "a garment sprinkled with blood"—His own blood, by the shedding of which He gained the victory over sin and death.

"And upon His head are many diadems." When in the opening of the first seal He issued forth alone, there was a crown upon His head. Now there are many; for the crowns of all His people are His; they cast them at His feet, and sing, "Crown Him, crown *Him* Lord of all." In another sense indeed it is equally true that on His head are many diadems; for He is King of Righteousness, King of Peace, King of Love; but all that really was included in the single crown which was already on His head at the opening of the first seal. That triple crown was His as soon as He had vanquished sin and death and hell in the conflict with Satan upon the cross; but the many diadems seem now to refer to the crowns He has won for all His people; for are they not all now "kings and priests to God"? And in harmony with this we see the great name

written on His vesture and on His thigh: "King of kings and Lord of lords."

But there is more than this to be said about the names in this great passage. We have seen already that the personal name of Christ is not used here any more than in any other vision of the Apocalypse. When He comes forth, He is greeted with shouts of "Faithful and True"; but we can scarcely call that a name. Farther down, however, there are three references to His name, first to one which remains unknown (v. 12), then to the name by which He is called by those who know Him (v. 13), and finally to the great name written on His vesture and on His thigh (v. 16). The unknown name reminds us that "No man knoweth the Son save the Father." It points in fact to His essential Deity. "Who can by searching find out God"? In His inmost being and nature He "dwelleth in light that is inaccessible." It is quite probable that here too we have the counterpart of the name of His great enemy. Recall it. The first word was "Mystery" (xvii. 5); and verily there is a mystery of iniquity which no pure mind can fathom. So, too, the first name of our Lord and Saviour is "Wonderful" (Isa. ix. 6). We cannot comprehend Him. We can only look, and wonder, and adore. "He hath a name written, which no one knoweth but He Himself." Yet we know Him. How? As the utterance of God to our souls. "His name is called the Word of God." That is what He is to us now; but when the Kingdom shall come, what shall be His name? Look up into the open heaven; look at the Rider on the white horse; see the name upon His vesture and His thigh—on the vesture stained with blood, symbol of His love, and on the thigh, symbol of His power, "KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS."

J. MONRO GIBSON.

SPIRITUAL DIAGNOSIS.

AN ARGUMENT FOR PLACING THE STUDY OF THE SOUL ON A SCIENTIFIC BASIS.¹

THE study of the soul in health and disease ought to be as much an object of scientific study and training as the health and diseases of the body.

It has long been one of the favourite axioms of Apologetics, that a Christian life is the best argument for Christianity. And, if an old argument, it is after all the best argument, for in these last days there is nothing in the philosophy of apologetical religion at all worth reviving compared with this living power of true lives. A free-thinker may go very far without meeting an argument to throw him back upon his own inner soul, but no one can live long, be he in high life or low life, without coming within the influence of a Christian man. The power of the individual, the value of the unit, the respect due to one human soul—this is the great truth for churches, for armies, and for empires. Students of the new science of sociology may deny this truth as they will, and their great disciple, Herbert Spencer, may denounce what he calls the “great-man-theory of history” as only fit for savages gossiping round their camp fire, but it still remains a great and important truth (as he himself expresses it before failing to refute it) “that throughout the past of the human race the doings of conspicuous persons have been the only things worthy of remembrance.”

The past has indeed no masses. *Men*, not masses, have done all that is great in history, in science, and in religion. The New Testament itself is but a brief biography; and many pages of the Old are marked by the lives of men.

¹ Essay read before the Theological Society, New College, Edinburgh, November, 1873.

Yet it is just this truth which we require to be taught again to-day—to be content with aiming at units. Every atom in the universe can act on every other atom, but only through the atom next it. And if a man would act upon every other man, he can do so best by acting, one at a time, upon those beside him. The true worker's world is a unit.

Recognise the personal glory and dignity of the unit as an agent. Work with units, but, above all, work *at* units.

But the capacity of acting upon individuals is now almost a lost art. It is hard to learn again. We have spoilt ourselves by thinking to draw thousands by public work—by what people call “pulpit eloquence,” by platform speeches, and by convocations and councils, Christian conferences, and by books of many editions. We have been painting Madonnas and Ecce Homos and choirs of angels, like Raphael, and it is hard to condescend to the beggar boy of Murillo. Yet we must begin again and begin far down. Christianity began with one. We have forgotten the simple way of the Founder of the greatest influence the world has ever seen—how He ran away from cities, how He shirked mobs, how He lagged behind the rest at Samaria to have a quiet talk with *one* woman at a well, how He stole away from crowds and entered into the house of *one* humble Syro-Phœnician woman, “and would have no man know it.” In small groups of twos and threes He collected the early Church around Him. One by one the disciples were called—and there were only twelve in all. We all know well enough how to move the masses; we know how to draw a crowd round us, but to attract the units—that is the hard matter. Teach us how to fascinate the unit by our glance, by our conversational oratory, by our mystery of sympathy! We know how to bring the mob about us, how to flash and storm in passion, how to work in the appeal at the right moment, how to play upon all the

figures of rhetoric in succession, and how to throw in a calm when no one expects, but every one wants it—every one knows this, or can know it easily; but to draw souls one by one, to buttonhole them and steal from them the secret of their lives, to talk them clean out of themselves, to read them off like a page of print, to pervade them with your spiritual essence and make them transparent, this is the spiritual science which is so difficult to acquire and so hard to practise.

“After a spirit of discernment says an old French Sage (La Bruyère) the next rarest thing in the world are diamonds and pearls.”¹ Of the three elements body, mind, and soul, which make up a responsible human being, two only have been hitherto treated as fit subjects for scientific inquiry. From six thousand years of contemplation of the phenomena of human life and thought, only two sciences have emerged. Physiology has told us all that is possible of the human body; psychology, of the mind. But the half is not accounted for. We wish, further, a spiritual psychology to tell us of the unseen realities of the soul. This is where our University training must be supplemented. It deals with man as a body and a mind. It forgets that man is a trinity. It is an extraordinary and momentous fact that by far the most important factor in human life has been up to this time all but altogether ignored by the thinking world. Of course every religious writer has a few notions upon the subject, but notions are not enough. If the mind is large enough and varied enough to make a philosophy of mind possible, is the soul such a trifling part of man that it is not worth while seeking to frame a science of it?—a science of it which men can learn, and which can be a guide and help in practice to all who feel an interest in the deepest thing in human life?

¹ “Après d’esprit de discernment ce qu’il a au monde de plus rare, ce sont les diamants et les perles” (*Caractères*).

It is no use to say there is no special soul—that there is a strange never-comprehended essence, half emotion, half affection, half reason, half unearthliness, to attempt to analyse which would only leave us, like Milton's philosophic angels, “in wandering mazes lost.” But this is the mere concealment of ignorance in mystery. There *is* a soul, and there is a spiritual life. Plato knew it and called it, in his wonderment over it, “the soulish mind.” Solomon knew it when he talked of “the hearing ear.” Addison knew it and defined it: “’Tis the divinity that stirs within us.” And in *Culture and Religion* the Principal of St. Andrew's University charges his students “that there is a faculty of spiritual apprehension which is very different from those which are trained in schools and colleges, which must be educated and fed not less but more carefully than our lower faculties, else it will be starved and die.”

The same thoughtful writer has put the problem which we are endeavouring to meet in plain and forcible terms. “But because the primary truths of religion,” he says, “refuse to be caught in the grip of the logical vice—because they are transcendent, and only mystically apprehended, are thinking men therefore either to give up these subjects as impossible to think about, or to content themselves with a vague religiosity, an unreal sentimentalism?” The Principal's question is a striking question. Are we content to let this great spiritual life work silently around us without attempting to know more about it, to analyze it, to make it more accessible to us and us to it? Are we to regard it as some weird element, unapproachable, mysterious, unstable, incomprehensible in its essence? There is, it is true, an element about it which keeps us at our distance from it; but as its groundwork is human may we not see the points where it touches the human, the changes it effects, the hindrances to the changes and the wonderful complexity of action and interaction which it

originates? Are there materials there for a philosophy, and is it lawful to reduce it to a science? Can there, in short, be a *science of spirituality*?

At first sight the idea is repulsive in the extreme. Yet a science is a classification of facts; and is there anything irreverent or presumptuous in attempting to classify the facts of the spiritual life? The facts, it may be answered, are too numerous; they are more than the sand of the sea. But so are the combinations of elements with which the chemist deals, and the modifications of morphological type with which the biologist deals, yet we have a chemistry and a biology. That, then, is the least of the difficulty. But a great one, apparently an insurmountable one, lies just on the threshold. The facts of physical science lie in the order of the natural, and they are finite. The facts of spiritual science, if we may call it so, lie in the order of the supernatural, and they are infinite. They are pervaded by an element which no man can fathom. "The Spirit bloweth where it listeth." We look in a man's soul for that which we saw there yesterday, but the unseen influence has swept across the heart and the spiritual scenery is changed. The man himself is the same, his passions unaltered in their strength, his foibles unchanged in their weakness, but the furniture of the soul has been moved, and the spiritual machinery goes on upon a new and suddenly developed principle. Here, then, our investigations are stopped at the outset. Dare we approach no nearer? Often we would fain do so. Often we are placed in such circumstances that plainly we must do so. A friend is in trouble, we are in trouble. But how are we to proceed? What guide have we in ministering to a soul diseased?

Is there no guide-book upon the subject, no chart or table of the logical history of the spiritual life, no chair of Spiritual Diagnosis? We do not mean a table such as Doddridge has given us in *The Rise and Progress of*

Religion in the Soul. The fatal error of that style of work is to give the inquiring soul the idea of a certain mechanical process to be passed through before conversion can be attained. But conversion does not always develop like a proposition in Euclid, or sensitized plate in photography. God the Creator will have no machine-made men in earth or heaven. And it is not His will that there should only be a few stereotyped forms of saints—the Richard Baxter type, the Jeremy Taylor type, and the Philip Doddridge type. Therefore it is a dangerous thing to put forms and processes, which exist only in the logical imagination, into the hands of the inquirer. But when these works are put into the hands of the Christian teacher or minister, their utility is beyond all praise. He, as spiritual adviser, should be thoroughly acquainted with the *rationale* of conversion. He should know it as a physician his pharmacopœia. He should know every phase of the human soul, in health and disease, in the fulness of joy and the blackness of despair. He should know the *Pilgrim's Progress* better than Bunyan. The scheme of salvation, as we are accustomed to call it, should be ever clearly defined in his consciousness. The lower stages, the period of transition, its solemnity, its despairs, its glimmering light, its growing faith; and the Christian life begun, the laborious working out in fear and trembling, the slavish scrupulosity, still the fearfulness of fall, still remorse, more faith, more hope; and last of all the higher spiritual life, the realization of freedom, the disappearance of the slavish scrupulosity, the pervasion of the whole life with God.

Such a skeleton is easily made and easily remembered, and it is all that many have to perform their work with; but it is no more adequate for its great task than is the compass of a schoolboy's whistle to take in the sweep of Handel's *Messiah*. To fill up such an outline with all the exquisite tracery of thought and emotion and doubt, which

develop within the mind of an inquiring soul, is a great and rare talent; and to apply such knowledge in the practice of daily life is a power which scarce one will be found to possess. Let not any think that such knowledge is easily attained; nor have many attained it. The men to whom you or I would go if spiritual darkness spread across our souls, who are they? How few have penetration enough to diagnose our case, to observe our least apparent symptoms, to get out of us what we had resolved not to tell them, to see through and through us the evil and the good. Plenty there are to preach to us, but who will interview us, and anatomize us, and lay us bare to God's eye and our own? X won't be preached to along with Y and Z and Q; that won't do X any good, for he thinks it is all meant for Y, Z, and Q. But to take X by himself; to feel his pulse alone, and give him one particular earnest word—the only one word that would do—all to himself—this is the simple feat which we look in vain for men to perform. There is a tendency piously to leave such matters to God, and say they are quite safe in His hands, who alone searcheth the heart. But He hath appointed us to be our brother's keeper, nor will He do for my brother what could be done by me. We cannot expect the Spirit's help to teach us what only laziness and personal indifference hinder us from learning; and to despise a power which He gave us capacities to possess is not the way to show that we trust Him who gave it. "*Placeat homini quidquid Deo placet.*"

This study of the soul, in which I am endeavouring to enlist your interest, is a difficult study. It is difficult, because the soul as far transcends the mind in complexity and in variety as the mind the body. The soul is an infinitely large subject—an infinitely deep and mysterious subject.

The chemist in his intricate analysis deals not with elements more subtle and evasive.

Ay, men may wonder while they scan
A living, thinking, feeling man.

But we do not need to go to Mrs. Browning, or to *Hamlet*, to be told "What a piece of work is man!" Apart altogether from the religious element in him, he is still the greatest mystery of science. Every man is a problem to every other man—much more every spiritual man. It is hard to know a man's brain, and harder to know his feelings; but hardest of all to know his religious convictions. It is hard to know the deepest that a man has. A well-known American essayist and poet has told us that the difficulty of analyzing our neighbour's character arises from the fact that every man is in reality a *threefold* man. When two persons are in conversation, there are really *six* persons in conversation. Thus, to put the paradox into the shape of an example, suppose that John and Tom are in conversation, there are *three Johns* and *three Toms*, who are accounted for in this way:

- | | | |
|----------------|---|--|
| Three
Johns | { | 1. The real John; known only to his Maker. |
| | | 2. John's ideal John; John, <i>i.e.</i> , as he thinks himself; never the real John, and often very unlike him. |
| | | 3. Tom's ideal John; <i>i.e.</i> , John as Tom thinks him; never the real John, nor John's John, but often very unlike either. |
| Three
Toms | { | 1. The real Tom. |
| | | 2. Tom's ideal Tom. |
| | | 3. John's ideal Tom. |

In this way when I talk to another it is not me that he hears talking, but his ideal of me; nor do I talk to him as he defines himself, but to my ideal of him. Now that ideal will, without almost inconceivable care and penetration on my part, be quite different also from his real self as God

only knows him, so that instead of speaking to his real soul, I may possibly be speaking to his ideal of his own soul, or more likely to my ideal of it.

From this it will be seen at a glance that the power of soul analysis is a hard thing to possess oneself of. It requires intense discrimination and knowledge of human nature—much and deep study of human life and character. The man with whom you speak being made up of two ideals—his own and yours, and one real—God's, it is one of the hardest possible tasks to abandon your ideal of him and get to know the real—God's. Then having known it, so far as possible to man, there remains the greatest difficulty of all—to introduce him to himself. You have created a new man for him, and he will not recognise him at first. He can see no resemblance to his ideal self; the new creature is not such a lovely picture as he would like to own; the lines are harshly drawn, and there is little grace and no poetry in it. But he must be told that none of us are what we seem; and if he would deal faithfully with himself, he must try to see himself differently from what he seems. Then he must be led with much delicacy to make a little introspection of himself; and with the mirror lifted to his own soul you read off together some of the indications which are defining themselves vaguely upon its surface. Even in social and domestic circles the difficulty of performing this apparently simple operation upon human nature is so keenly felt that scarce one friend will be found with a friendship true enough to perform it to another. And in religious matters it will be at once conceded that the complexity of the difficulties increases the problem a hundredfold.

There is a danger, however—speaking next of the more directly religious aspects of the question—in exaggerating these difficulties; and, indeed, the further objection may have occurred to some minds that, by attaching so much

importance to the human power we take away the one great element in salvation—its Divine freeness through the grace of God.

Is not religion for the poor and illiterate? is not the way easy to find? Thank God it is so! So little can man do to enlighten it. But he can do something, and he ought to do more. In this more than in anything else he is his brother's keeper. Not for himself does man live. Every action of every man has an ancestry and a posterity—an ancestry and a posterity in other lives. "Each reads his fate in the other's eyes," says Emerson. "I am a part of all that I have met," says Tennyson. And how do you explain that most wonderful phenomenon, which is as surpassing a contemplation to some minds as the thought of eternity itself—the *silence of God*? God keeping silence! And man doubting and sinning and repenting all alone, and groping blindfold after truth, and losing his way and working out his salvation with painful trembling and fear! It is an unfathomable mystery; but it may not be, in small part, just for this that on the one hand, God offers man the glory and honour of sharing his work; and on the other, that He wishes human souls to be graven with the marks of other human souls in all their free and infinite variety. God is a God of variety. No two leaves are the same, no two sand grains, no two souls. And as the universe would be but a poor affair if every leaf were the counterpart of the oak leaf or the birch, so would the spiritual world present but a sorry spectacle if we were all duplicates of John Calvin. Therefore has God made room for individual action in the building up of His kingdom upon earth; and therefore it is not a presumption but a duty for every man to be moulding and making the souls around him, to be perfecting and guiding his own faculties for this great work. The great danger in doing this work, next to doing it without any education for it, is to overdo it. In dealing with

a case which is once put into our hands we are apt to consider it too much of a professional and personal matter. Our influence has become too conscious. We have found what a powerful thing it may become, and we seek a "reputation for influence." Thus our pride is smitten if success does not at once crown our efforts, and we attempt to second them by unlawful means. We assume the didactic when we should simply be attractive or suggestive. We encourage the favourable and forget to notice an unfavourable symptom. We supply allopathic when prudence would suggest homœopathic doses. And finally, we assume too much upon ourselves, forgetting that we are but fellow-workers together with God, and by taking too officious an interest, the individual, making nothing of it, is apt to throw the responsibility of non-success upon us, and so spoil not only our whole influence with others, but his own chance of being bettered in the future by others.

There are also limits to the exercise of this power which are as yet not well defined, and which rest at present upon no religio-philosophic basis, but on mere empiricism. The whole subject, indeed, rests in the meantime only upon the merest individual empiricism; and it is a matter of profound regret that so sacred and important a subject should exist in such a dishevelled state when the scientific method, which is being applied to so many trivial matters, could be so easily applied to it. We can conceive of some minds being deeply shocked to hear of scientific observations being taken on a human soul, and adjustments made to it, and results calculated as if it were a mere question of spectrum analysis. But the irreverence is only in the words. We *do* wish a scientific treatment of the subject; and if there is anything to sadden and humble in the contemplation of the religious work of the day, it is the thought of the crude and slipshod treatment of one of the most sacred subjects in the religious life.

We are not ignoring the power of God in conversion by not speaking of it. You say He can work with the roughest tools even on the finest of marbles. Without denying it, He would not polish diamonds on grindstones if He could get lapidaries to do it better. It won't do to talk religiously, or complacently, or *blasphemously* of trusting in Him when we are too lazy to qualify ourselves for being worth the using in His service. Don't fear that we shall become too acute at diagnosing and prescribing for souls, and so take the matter out of God's hands.

And now, in conclusion, as to the great subject of the training and exercise of the power of spiritual discernment, what is it possible for us to say? We can indeed but guess at it. Those who have thought of it have confessed that everything yet remains to be done. Thus one of the keenest minds of New England has said, "The school of the future may be called a *Life School*, whose object is to study the strength and weakness of human nature minutely, . . . to understand *men*, and to deal with them face to face, and heart to heart, . . . and in regard to such a school as this, while there has been much done incidentally, the revised procedure of education yet awaits development and accomplishment." Henry Ward Beecher, in his Yale lecture (on preaching), has given to this subject perhaps by far the most valuable popular contribution of the age. His chapter on the study of Human Nature is especially discriminating, and only the knowledge that there must now be few into whose hands that work has not fallen prevents us stealing time to make lengthened quotations. (Let two suffice, page 85 and page 94.) Beecher, had he been less of a preacher and more of a pastor, could have been one of the greatest students of the soul. As it is, he is surpassed by few, perhaps by none in this country, only by Dr. Spencer¹ in his own. Spurgeon is

¹ Author of *Pastor's Sketches*.

not so much of a practical analyst as a self-introspectionist. So also was Thomas à Kempis and Blaise Pascal, and pious John Hervey and quaint Robert Bruce, and so also in a sense was Dr. Duncan, and Dr. Gouldburn, who has done for spirituality what Burton did for melancholy. The Puritan writers, and pre-eminent among them Baxter and Owen, were skilled analysts of human nature, but they seem to have applied their power more in the pulpit than the pew. In this respect, too, Bunyan was quite unsurpassed, and in some of his sermons, specially his famous "last" one, the most masterly specimens of this kind of work are to be found.

Yet with all this perfection there was always something wrong about these men from the practical point of view. They knew so much about humanity that they had lost what of it they had themselves in the pursuit of it in others. Although they are always called practical hands, they are only so in a gross sense. They were most of them wanting in that delicacy of handling which makes analysis effective instead of insulting; and many of the Puritans were quite destitute of the foremost quality which distinguishes the successful diagnostist—respect, veneration even, for the soul of another. A man may be ever so gross and vulgar, but when you come to deal with the deepest that is in him, he becomes sensitive and feminine. Brusqueness and an impolite familiarity may do very well when dealing with his brains, but without tenderness and courtesy you can only approach his heart to shock it. The whole of etiquette is founded on respect; and by far the highest and tenderest etiquette is the etiquette of soul and soul.

To know and remember the surpassing dignity of the human soul—for its own sake, for its great God-like elements, for its immortality, above all for His sake who made it and gave Himself for it—this is the first axiom to be remembered. Many men study men, but not to sym-

pathize with them : the lawyer for gain, the artist for fame, the actor for applause, the novelist for profession. How well up is the actor in plot and passion and intrigue ! how deftly can the novelist anatomize love and jealousy, vengeance and hate ! And when there are men found to study human nature for its own sake, or for filthy lucre's sake, shall there be none to do it for man's sake—for God's sake ? There is one great reason why the ministry of so many great and holy men has been so far from being what is called a converting ministry. We read their biographies, and shrink into nothingness at the contemplation of such holiness and saintliness of life as we had never dreamed possible to man, and we marvel, and greatly, that one irreligious, unconverted man should be left in the whole country-side but we find indeed that their parish was no better than its neighbours. And the explanation is plain. Those men laboured under a terrible disease—it is called Theophobia—the name explains itself. A minister catches it, and his power is gone. Men are awed by it, venerate it as they venerate few things else. They will speak of it and praise it, but never imitate it. It is a grand but useless spectacle. Those who have it become wrapped up in one subject ; and though that be the highest of all, it is nevertheless a monstrosity when followed to the exclusion of everything else. The sympathies of these men are all and always Godwards. They are always vindicating God. Their whole atmosphere is of God. They have left earth before their time. They have left human nature in the lurch ; they have forgotten humanity, and humanity can no longer profit by them, it can only wonder at them. Their thoughts go always straight up to God, and are never healthy enough to be refracted back upon man. Now to get to God is a high thing, but they only get at one side of Him. They don't see over to the other side, which is inclined towards *man*. Yet to get to man by way of God, and

God by way of man, is the only way to keep the entire health of the soul.

We have much yet to say of this study, but the subject must end almost before it is begun. The one great thing is to study life earnestly and practically and realistically.

* * * * *

We must aim at the manly and sturdy type of the religious diagnostist; we must try to be, as Oliver Wendell Holmes forcibly says, "a man that knows men in the street, at their work, human nature in its shirt sleeves—who makes bargains with deacons instead of talking over texts with them, and a man who has found out that there are plenty of praying rogues and swearing saints in the world."

One thing I can assure you of. If any man develops this faculty of reading others, of reading them in order to profit by them, he will never be without practice. Men do not say much about these things, but the amount of spiritual longing in the world at the present moment is absolutely incredible. No one can ever even faintly appreciate the intense spiritual unrest which seethes everywhere around him; but one who has tried to discern, who has begun by private experiment, by looking into himself, by taking observations upon the people near him and known to him, has witnessed a spectacle sufficient to call for the loudest and most emphatic action. Gentlemen, I have but vaguely hinted at this subject; I venture to think it a question of vital interest, giving life a mission, giving a new and burning interest even to the most commonplace surroundings, and opening up a field for lifelong study and effort.

HENRY DRUMMOND.

NOTE ON THE DATE OF THE FIRST EPISTLE
OF PETER.

ON page 43 of the last volume of the EXPOSITOR Prof. Ramsay has given my name in connection with an argument for dating 1 Peter some years after the death of Paul. I should like to outline the argument in full, as it is an argument founded on no hypothesis evolved from my inner consciousness, but on the text of the Epistle.

From 1 Peter v. 12, 13 we learn that Silas and Mark were with Peter in Rome when he wrote his letter to the Pauline Churches.

Prof. Ramsay has pointed out (*loc. cit.*) how impossible it is to think of Peter writing to these Churches in this manner during Paul's lifetime. And what are we to say of the presence of Silas and Mark?

Mark was the assistant of Paul and Barnabas during their first missionary journey, and the occasion of their separation. For his second journey Paul had to choose a companion in place of Barnabas. He chose Silas, and we have no reason for supposing that Silas ever left the service of the Apostle until death parted them. Later in the journey Paul chose Timothy to fill Mark's place.

But in after years Mark was restored to Paul's favour (Col. iv. 10), and at the last became almost indispensable (1 Tim. iv. 11) to the great general. We cannot well think of Paul and Mark being in Rome at the same time without being together. It is hard to think of either Silas or Mark leaving the service of their leader in his last years.

And yet here is Peter writing in Rome, where Paul spent many of his last days, writing to the Pauline Churches, and having in his service two of Paul's henchmen. And there is not in the letter, throbbing as it does with Pauline

thought, one word to show that Rome, or the Churches, or Silas and Mark have ever had any connection with Paul.

Is it not then certain from these two verses alone that at the time of writing Paul had been dead some years, during which Peter had taken his place in Gentile Christendom and in the allegiance of the men trained by him? Paul is not present, nor is he near.

F. WARBURTON LEWIS.

LOVE AND RIGHTEOUSNESS:

A STUDY ON THE INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY ON LANGUAGE.

WE have endeavoured to show in former papers that Christian writers, in making use of the Greek language, the noblest and most subtle instrument of human speech ever invented, repudiated, not without deliberate purpose, certain terms which involved, or might seem to involve, the acceptance of unworthy Pagan ideals and aims; and at the same time appropriated to Christian use other terms which conveyed the expression of that which was best and purest in pre-Christian thought.

But more than this was needed. A further step had to be taken in the literature of the gospel. Christianity had literally revealed a new life, and required a fresh vocabulary to express the new conditions. Words, therefore, came into use which were, in some cases, absolutely new inventions, in others so charged with fresh meaning as to be equivalent to new words.

Of these words *ἀγάπη* (love or charity) is the pre-eminent example. *Ἀγάπη*, which expresses the highest Christian grace, the bond of the Christian Society, the fulfilment of the new law which Christ bequeathed, and which expresses the essence of the Divine nature (1 St. John iv. 8), is not classical in the sense of being found in the extant writings of Greek authors. It is, however, used by the LXX. translators, and may possibly have been a vernacular word long before it took its place in literature.

The use of *ἀγάπη* in the LXX., however, differs widely

from its use in the New Testament. In the LXX. ἀγάπη is used in a sense identical with ἔρως, a word absolutely excluded from the New Testament, and employed in two passages only of the LXX. Old Testament—Proverbs vii. 18 and xxx. 16, in the latter of which there is a clear mis-translation, ἔρως γυναικός, where Aquila and Symmachus render more correctly : ἐποχὴ μήτρας, *Aq.* ; συνοχὴ μήτρας, *Sym.* In this sense of ἔρως, or the passion of love, ἀγάπη occurs in 2 Samuel xiii. 15, Jeremiah ii. 2, and frequently in the Song of Songs ; in Ecclesiastes ix. 1 and 6 the sense is neutral.

So far, then, as its antecedents were concerned ἀγάπη could not present an unblemished title for admission into the language of Christians. But if the choice lay between ἀγάπη and ἔρως, there could be no question as to the decision. For it must be remembered that the language of the Song of Songs is capable of, and was very generally interpreted in, a spiritualized sense ; while ἔρως, though idealized by Plato into a very high conception, was so steeped with the worst associations of Pagan life as to render it ill adapted to convey the sublime message of Divine love.

It is true that this scrupulous exclusion of ἔρως did not last, and we shall presently see (*infra*, pp. 324, 325) that the admission of the word is an early example of a process of deterioration in Christian nomenclature.

On the other hand, ἀγάπη, with its literary freshness, its immunity from evil, its suggestion of pure and self-sacrificing affection, rendered it an apt instrument to deliver the supreme message of the gospel.

The word itself indeed, as we have shown, was not classical, but the thought conveyed by it had entered into the purest presentments of Greek life, and is summed up in one of the most beautiful and touching lines in Greek tragedy : οὗτοι συνέχθειν ἀλλὰ συμφιλεῖν ἔφυν (Ant. 523).

The use of ἀγάπη in the New Testament is full of the deepest interest. It occurs twice only in the Synoptic Gospels, but in Luke xi. 42 it is qualified by τοῦ Θεοῦ, therefore once only in the sense of "brotherly love"; and then on the lips of Christ when He prophesies the coldness of love in the latter days, ψυχήσεται ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν πολλῶν, "The love of the majority shall grow cold" (Matt. xxiv. 12).

In the Fourth Gospel ἀγάπη is used several times, especially in chapter xv. In the Epistles of St. John it is found still more frequently; and in the other writings of the New Testament, with the exception of the Epistle General of St. James, few important words occur so often as ἀγάπη.

The conclusion from these facts seems to be that in the earlier presentation of the gospel which the Synoptists have given the immense significance of ἀγάπη as an element in the Christian life was not fully understood or realized. But as experience of the renewed life, and the continuous prompting of the Holy Spirit, taught the disciples of Christ how deeply and essentially ἀγάπη entered into their life, and that this had assuredly been the purpose of the Lord Jesus, the word and thought of love take their rightful and pre-eminent position in the literature and system of Christianity, so that Christianity itself is summed up in ἀγάπη. In this view our Lord's words (Matt. xxiv. 12) cited above are strikingly prophetic. When the words were spoken, the Divine Society of which ἀγάπη was to be the watchword and guiding principle had not been founded. But our Lord's prediction carries us forward to a time when the Church shall have taken root and flourished, and gathered to itself many adherents, and beyond that to the time when, from some cause known then to Christ alone, the majority of Christians shall have cooled in their enthusiasm and their love, which was so essentially a part of the Christian life that when love grew cold faith died.

This single utterance of Christ prepares us for the place which ἀγάπη takes in the Christian life. It is Christ's own word. And henceforth the disciples of Christ become ἀδελφοὶ ἀγαπητοί, beloved of God (Rom. i. 7), and of the apostles (1 Cor. x. 14 and *passim*), and of one another (1 Thess. iii. 12; 1 John iii. 11). No one has seen the depth and significance of ἀγάπη more clearly or instructively than St. Paul. And in two passages especially of profound teaching (Rom. v. 5-8; 1 Cor. xiii.) the meaning, both in its Divine and human aspect, is impressed for ever on the conscience of mankind. As time went on the power of "love" grew; and in the latest apostolic message St. John, "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς, John xxi. 7), handed down to the Church the Master's legacy of love (John xv. 12), and taught by the highest sanction the absolute necessity of this gift for the spiritual life: "He that loveth not knoweth not God, for God is love" (ἀγάπη, 1 John iv. 8).

The high and sacred position of ἀγάπη in Christian nomenclature is sustained by its use in the writings of the subapostolic and succeeding epochs. St. Ignatius speaks of ἀγάπη as "the blood of Jesus Christ" (ἐν ἀγάπῃ ὃ ἐστὶν αἷμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ), as faith is "the flesh of the Lord" (Trall. c. viii.). It is "the way that leads up to God" (ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη ὁδὸς ἡ ἀναφέρουσα εἰς Θεόν, *Id. Eph. ix.*). The same father describes the Church of Rome as "having the presidency of love" (προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης, *Rom. inscrip.*). Chrysostom speaks of ἀγάπη as "the beginning and the end of all excellence" (ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος ἀρετῆς ἀπάσης), and as "the impress (χαρακτήρ) of the servants of God, the mark of the apostles." With Theophylact ἀγάπη is "the head and spring of the upright life" (τὸ κεφάλαιον καὶ ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ ὀρθοῦ βίου).

It is, however, to be observed that some of the early Christian writers did not scruple to use ἔρως, or "passionate

love," in place of the apostolic ἀγάπη. Theodoret, for instance, says: "He who hath received the Divine love (ὁ τὸν ἔρωτα τὸν θεῖον δεξιόμενος) despises all earthly things." And St. Ignatius (Rom. c. vii.) uses the remarkable expression, ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἐσταύρωται, "my love hath been crucified." And although the words have been variously rendered—Origen, for example, interpreting ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως of Christ, while others give the meaning of earthly lust or desire—we note the introduction of the word ἔρως into the Christian vocabulary as a mark of decline, and a departure from the apostolic purity of expression.!

But the sacred character of ἀγάπη has been impaired in other ways besides this admission of ἔρως as a synonym.

It was perhaps hardly to be expected that the New Testament standard of meaning could be sustained. But it is a remarkable instance of perverted meaning that through transference to another tongue the sublime conception of Christian love as described by St. Paul should have become narrowed to a signification which that description excludes. Yet so it is. The English "charity," directly representing *caritas*, the Latin equivalent of ἀγάπη, has all but lost the attributes of its Greek parentage, and is now used to signify almsgiving, which St. Paul shows to be distinct from ἀγάπη (1 Cor. xiii. 3), or else fairness and forbearance in judgment, which corresponds to a part, but a part only, of St. Paul's definition.

It is easy to trace the steps by which "charity" settled into the meaning of "almsgiving," that being, of course, the most obvious and the most recognisable expression of brotherly love. But the loss to the language of Christianity is serious. The result is that Christianity is left without any term to express its highest ideal. When the Revisers sought a rendering for ἀγάπη, they were left to choose between "love" and "charity." The former had the objection of a wide and, in many respects, an unsuitable

connotation; the latter possessed the defect of having a divergent meaning imposed by popular use.

The only remedy for the Christian student is either to read and think in the language of the Greek Testament, or to grasp in its fulness the original conception of ἀγάπη, and to think or read that into its English equivalent.

It is a striking fact in the history of language and of religious thought that that which happened to ἀγάπη, the representative word of Christianity, happened in some measure also to δικαιοσύνη (righteousness), the representative word of Judaism. Both words came in the end to denote "almsgiving." As "almsgiving" was the obvious outcome of brotherly love, so it came to be regarded with the Jew as the highest act of righteousness. Familiar evidence of this will be found in the various reading Matthew vi. 1, where, in place of the true reading, δικαιοσύνην is found, in the less authoritative MSS., ἐλεημοσύνην, a word inserted in all probability as a marginal gloss to explain δικαιοσύνην. Jerome has, "Justitiam hoc est eleemosynam." Compare also the parallelism in Psalm cxii. 9: "He hath dispersed, he hath given to the needy; his righteousness endureth for ever." And in Daniel iv. 27: "Break off thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by showing mercy to the poor."

But although, in comparison with ἀγάπη, δικαιοσύνη, or "righteousness," holds a secondary place in the New Testament as a note of the Christian life, and although it is not, like ἀγάπη, a creation of Christianity, it is a word of momentous importance. Apart from revelation its roots went deep into the religious consciousness of mankind, and it introduced both into Judaism and Christianity the purest and most inspiring of moral ideas. The word δικαιοσύνη does not occur in the Greek poets, but with Homer justice (δίκη) is "the everlasting attribute of Zeus." In Pindar the righteous are the special care of the gods (Nem. x. 54);

and justice is beautifully described as "sister of peace," and both are "golden children of wise Themis" (Ol. xiii. 7). "The unwritten laws of Divine justice are more ancient than the law of living princes, and transcend them," says Antigone (Soph. Antig. 454); and Euripides speaks of justice as "stronger than injustice" (Ion. 1117). The conception rises to a still higher level in the Platonic and Aristotelian systems. The beautiful story of Er, the son of Armenius, with which the *Republic* closes, sets forth better than by formal definition the Platonic view of "righteousness" in terms not unworthy to be compared with the description of judgment in Matthew xxv. With Aristotle justice is "the starting-point of right action and of right desire"; it is "the sum of all other excellencies"; it is "more beautiful than the morning or evening star." It differs from perfect virtue only in a way which makes it superior to virtue; for it is the *use* of virtue. A man cannot be righteous to himself alone. It is goodness that imparts itself (*κοινωνική ἀρετή*, *Pol.* iii., xiii. 3). With such a history and such an alliance of noble and divine thoughts the Hellenic *δικαιοσύνη* had gifts to impart to Judaism as well as gifts to receive. The knowledge of all that *δικαιοσύνη* meant and connoted would incline the Hellenic proselyte to view with favour a religion which was based upon righteousness. And soon he would learn that as an attribute of Jehovah "righteousness" had risen to higher levels than ever in Greek philosophy.

But as with *ἀγάπη*, usage lowered the conception of righteousness, and in the decline of Judaism righteousness came to signify little more than an exact performance of legal requirements, which was often destructive of righteousness in its higher and truer sense.

It was the office of Christianity, then, to define and exemplify *δικαιοσύνη*, the true righteousness. The righteousness of the New Testament goes back to the righteousness of the

Old Testament as its type, but enlarges its scope with the deeper and wider revelation in Christ.

Out of the vast subject here suggested three points may be selected to illustrate the developed idea of righteousness through Christianity.

1. The gradual revelation of a Divine righteousness in the gospel accounts for the power of the gospel and for its effectiveness for salvation. The gospel is a force working for salvation *because* righteousness is revealed in it. This great truth is expressed in Romans i. 17: *δικαιοσύνη γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, καθὼς γέγραπται, ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται*. Here righteousness is regarded as inherent in God and imparted to man. Its condition and starting-point is faith, and in the process of revelation faith grows and deepens (*ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν*). This Divine righteousness, then, is revealed or manifested in the life of a human soul, and in the movements of the world and of society. It is for a Christian the key to history, and the explanation of the deepest mystery of our faith, the atonement through Jesus Christ: *ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ* (Rom. iii. 25).

2. The important phrase (Rom. iii. 26), *εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιῶντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ*, emphasizes and explains *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ*. It teaches that the righteousness of God is the cause of man's righteousness. To use logical expressions, it is the formal, efficient and final cause of man's righteousness. For Divine and human righteousness are one and the same thing, and human righteousness springs from, and is always aiming at, Divine righteousness. This is a purely Christian truth, and rests upon the mystery of the Incarnation. The expression itself, *εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιῶντα*, does not mean "in order that he should be just and yet the justifier"—there is no concessive force in the participle—but "that he should be just

and the justifier," righteous and giver of righteousness. As to *δικαιοῦν*, we take it in its first and literal meaning "to make righteous," rather than in its forensic meaning "to acquit." But, indeed, closely examined, the two meanings coincide. And the difficulty disappears if we remember that all human righteousness is imperfect, and that Divine forgiveness is accorded to incipient, and therefore an imperfect, righteousness; and, secondly, that acquittal of a prisoner by a human judge implies, and is intended to convey, the innocence of the accused person. Acquittal, therefore, by a Divine Judge not only implies, but proves, righteousness the result of forgiveness through the creative power of a merciful God.

3. A third accession of meaning which righteousness has received through the Christian revelation is concerned with the meaning and results of it as an attribute of God in Christ Jesus. As such righteousness is the source and ground of forgiveness of sins. This truth is expressed in 1 John i. 9: *ἐὰν ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, πιστός ἐστιν καὶ δίκαιος ἵνα ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας, καὶ καθαρίσῃ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀδικίας*; "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." The use of the particle *ἵνα* with adjectives and nouns is characteristic of St. John's style; comp. John i. 27, *ἄξιός ἵνα κ.τ.λ.*: 1 John iii. 11, *ἡ ἀγγελία . . . ἵνα κ.τ.λ.*: 1 John iv. 21, *τὴν ἐντολὴν ἔχομεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ἵνα κ.τ.λ.* In these and other passages *ἵνα* expresses both purpose or aim, and result. For in the Hebrew thought where Divine action is concerned, aim and result are identified. The teaching, then, of the words cited above is that the faithfulness (*πίστις*) and righteousness (*δικαιοσύνη*) of God have for aim and result remission of sins and cleansing from all unrighteousness on the condition of confession of sins. Here *δικαιοσύνη* combines in an ascending scale the Greek, and Jewish,

and Christian use of the word. It contains the original Greek sense of due apportionment, the Hebrew sense of the Divine character of righteousness tending to mercy and forgiveness, and the extended Christian sense of forgiveness through Jesus Christ, who is essentially *δίκαιος*, the "Righteous One." 1 John ii. 1: *παράκλητον ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δίκαιον*, where, as Bishop Westcott says, "the adjective is not a simple epithet, but marks predicatively ("being as He is righteous") that characteristic of the Lord which gives efficacy to His advocacy of Man."

It may be remarked that the rendering of the adjective and noun by "just" and "justice" respectively in place of "righteous" and "righteousness" is, perhaps, inevitable. But the result is a loss to the English reader, and there is always a danger lest the use of the alternative rendering should unconsciously influence the mind by suggesting human analogies which certainly ought not to be pressed.

But verbal dangers of this kind meet the theological student at every turn; and an examination into the history of Christian controversy will show the risk of basing arguments on translated words, or on Greek words which are not found in those passages of the Greek Testament in which the dispute centres.

ARTHUR CARR.

THE EVIDENTIAL VALUE OF MIRACLE.

It is reported of the philosopher Spinoza that he once declared himself willing to profess Christianity if only he could be convinced of the raising of Lazarus. I do not know whether the story be truth or fiction ; but in any case it has been often repeated both by believers and unbelievers in the Christian Creed, as if it represented the reasonable utterance of a thoughtful and serious man. The logic has been supposed, on all hands, to be quite rigorous. If the Founder of Christianity were able to work miracles, then He must have been what He represented Himself to be ; if, on the other hand, we can never be sure that His miraculous works were really observed while He was on earth, then we must not accept the Son of Mary as the Son of God. Miracles have been proposed as the principal credentials of the Christ ; the main body of Christian apologetics has been devoted to their defence ; and it has not infrequently been supposed that if men could be persuaded that the evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus was logically complete, they would, with one consent, offer Him their allegiance as their Lord and their God. Some such assumptions as these underlie the English theology of the 18th century. Butler, with hardly less qualification than Paley, takes miracles to be the appropriate proof of revelation. And, although Butler was far too wise to believe that men's conduct is ever entirely regulated by their speculative beliefs on nice points of doctrine, or on complicated questions of historical fact, yet his successors have often expressed themselves as if they thought that our belief in the Fatherhood of God, and our hope of everlasting life had no other foundation than the miraculous works of Jesus Christ.

Within the last ten years it has seemed more than once as if the reaction against these opinions were likely to go

very far indeed. Nothing is more remarkable than the complete repudiation of what is contemptuously described as "eighteenth century theology"; and it is proclaimed with emphasis, if not with authority, that miracles have very little to say to doctrine, that their evidential value is very trifling, and that, in any case, we do not believe in Christ because we believe in miracles, but that we believe in miracles because we believe in Christ.

There is a preliminary question, which it may be necessary to resolve, before we attempt the reconciliation of these two conflicting theories of miracle. It is worth while to ask, What, as a matter of fact, is the function assigned to Christ's miracles in the Gospels? When we have determined that, we shall be the better able to define their proper position in modern apologetics. However miracles may ultimately be explained, and whether or not they can be explained at all, it is plain that they occupy a very large place in the life of Christ as set forth in the New Testament. They are described as Christ's *works*, as His *signs*, as His *powers*; they are, certainly, more than the credentials of the Great Prophet. They are, many of them, symbols of grace, tokens of the love of God, signs of Him who, as the Collect says, "shows His almighty power most chiefly in showing mercy and pity." That ought not to be forgotten; it is not likely to be forgotten. But we ought not entirely to overlook the value which is assigned to them, in an *evidential* point of view, by Christ and His Apostles.

1. First, then, they are not necessarily convincing; they do not compel belief. So it was sternly and gravely said to Dives in the parable, *If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.* There are certain forms of unbelief which, far from being affected by the proof that a miracle was worked in the past, would not be affected by a miracle worked here and now. There is such a thing as a man

hardening his heart against the acceptance of anything which he does not wish to believe. He has eyes, but he sees not, and will not understand. The thing is so common in every-day experience that it hardly needs illustration. A man thinks ill of his neighbour, and *nothing* will convince him that he is wrong in his suspicions. Or another does not wish to abandon his careless habits of life, and he deliberately neglects the repeated testimony of his friends as to their inevitable consequence. You cannot convince a man of anything against his will. There is a kind of moral and spiritual callousness which resists all invitations to pure and godly living as simply irrelevant and inappropriate. So it was in the story with the Five Brethren of Dives. They were in a fair way of going to hell; but not even a miracle would have turned them aside from the path they had chosen. The spiritual world lay so entirely beyond the horizon of their interests, that the true significance of a message—a visitor—from that world would not have been perceived by them at all.

There is a spiritual inertia which no miracle could disturb. And this is illustrated more than once in the history of the Gospels. The miracles of Christ did not always win men's allegiance, or inspire them with belief in His claims. *Though He had done so many signs before them, yet they believed not on Him*, writes St. John.¹ And, again, how instructive and how true to human nature is the account of the raising of Lazarus! *Many therefore . . . which beheld what He did, believed on Him. But some of them went away to the Pharisees, and told them the things which Jesus had done.*² They accepted the fact that a miracle had been worked, but they did not therefore admit the claims of the Christ. And so, when the scoffing priests at the Crucifixion cried out in hate, *Let Him now come down from the cross, and we will believe Him*,³ it is extremely

¹ St. John xii. 37.

² St. John xi. 45, 46.

³ St. Matt. xxvii. 42.

unlikely that their scorn would have been suddenly converted into worship if they had been taken at their word.

The evidence of a miracle, then, is not irresistible; it will not carry conviction of the truth of the message, or the authority of the prophet, to one who is unwilling to be convinced. It does not force assent. So it was in the first century; so it is in the nineteenth. Paley's "proofs" are absolutely beside the point to one who is not serious in his quest for a Deliverer from sin.

2. None the less it has always been popularly believed that a miracle has a power of conviction which no ordinary preaching can have. *If one go to them from the dead, they will repent*, said Dives. He was wrong, for his brothers were past conviction. But had they been less abandoned in the ways of sin, the warnings of one who had returned from the unseen world to speak to them *might* have roused them from their spiritual torpor.

And the miracles of the gospel are repeatedly said to have arrested the attention and quickened the faith of those who witnessed them. *What manner of man is this*, asked the wondering disciples, *that even the winds and the sea obey Him?*¹ *Depart from me, for I am a sinful man*, said St. Peter in awe and adoration, as he recognised that the unexpected command, *Let down your nets for a draught*, had been prompted by superhuman wisdom.² The result of the first miracle of all is thus described by the Evangelist: *This beginning of His signs did Jesus in Cana of Galilee and manifested His glory; and His disciples believed on Him.*³ And not only His chosen companions were impressed by these works of power and pity; the curious and fickle multitude were aroused to admiration by the mastery over man and nature which was one of the signs of the Christ. After the feeding of the Five Thousand they would have

¹ St. Matt. viii. 27.

² St. Luke v. 8.

³ St. John ii. 11.

made Him a king.¹ On another occasion we read that *many believed on His Name, beholding the signs which He did.*² And the raising of the widow of Nain's son was followed by a great outburst of popular favour. *Fear took hold on all, and they glorified God saying, A great prophet is arisen among us; and God hath visited His people.*³ And this report concerning Him went abroad throughout the country.

But all this, it may be said, only shows that ignorant and unthinking people are impressed by miracle, or by what they take to be miracle, because they do not know better. It does not show that the Galilæan peasants rightly interpreted the intention of Jesus in these acts of mercy, or that they derived from His signs the lesson which He desired them to learn. This evidential function of miracle occupies, it is urged, but a very secondary place in the discourses of Christ Himself.

Here is the point of real consequence. Christian theology must, in the last resort, fall back on the words of Christ. And I cannot but think that those who make little of the miraculous in the earthly ministry of Jesus have overlooked the language which He used about His "signs," His tokens of power and of wisdom. *The very works that I do, He declared, bear witness of Me.*⁴ *That ye may know, He said when the palsied man was brought to Him, that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins, I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thy house.*⁵ The healing of the sick was the credential of His claim to be the pardoner of sin. When the tidings reached the disciples that Lazarus was dead, He said that it was well, for the miracle of his recovery would be the greater "sign." *I am glad for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent ye may believe.*⁶ He rebuked the greedy multitude because

¹ St. John vi. 15.² St. John ii. 23.³ St. Luke vii. 16.⁴ St. John v. 36.⁵ St. Mark ii. 10, 11.⁶ St. John xi. 15.

they followed Him for what they might get, and not because of the miracles which had shown Him for what He was. *Ye seek Me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye ate of the loaves and were filled.*¹ He upbraided the cities wherein most of His mighty works were done, because they repented not. *Woe unto thee, Chorazin ! woe unto thee, Bethsaida ! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon which were done in you, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes.*² The witness of St. Peter was true, and it was in entire agreement with our Lord's own teaching: *Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God unto you by mighty works and wonders and signs.*³ And although St. John specially notes that *many other signs* were done by Jesus which are not recorded, yet *these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God ; and that believing ye may have life in His name.*⁴ This evidential function of miracles was not merely an accidental result, brought about by the credulity of the contemporaries of Christ ; it was, if we are to trust the Gospels, a function which miracles and the record of them were to discharge throughout the Christian centuries.

3. We have seen that miracles do not compel a reluctant assent. We have also seen that when they have taken place, it is no mark of piety or of intelligence to disregard their evidential importance. But it must be remembered, further, that Christ steadily refused to work them to gratify a curiosity which was merely speculative. The leprous, the blind, the deaf were healed ; but again and again they were bidden to keep the secret of their deliverance. *Tell no man*, is His word of dismissal.⁵ He did not desire a discipleship which would be attracted by marvel only. Herod *hoped to see some sign done by Him ;*⁶ but no sign was

¹ St. John vi. 26.² St. Matt. xi. 20, 21.³ Acts ii. 22.⁴ St. John xx. 31.⁵ St. Matt. viii. 4, ix. 30 ; St. Mark viii. 26, vii. 36.⁶ St. Luke xxiii. 8.

wrought. The scribes and Pharisees sought a sign in like manner, and He answered with indignation, *An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of Jonah the prophet.*¹

To demand such signs, as if we had a right to claim them of the Christ, is always indeed a mark of an immature faith; the allegiance which is gained by their display, although it may be true allegiance, is a lesser thing than the faith which is enkindled by a patient following of the great Master. *Believe Me*, He said on the eve of His Passion to those who knew Him best, *Believe Me that I am in the Father and the Father in Me; or else believe Me for the very works' sake.*² It is better to accept Him on such grounds than not to accept Him at all; but that is not the highest stage of Christian discipleship. He rewarded the faith of the man who begged Him to hasten to the sick-bed of his dying child, who feared that He would be too late; but He said to Him in sorrow, before He spoke the words of healing and of power, *Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe.*³ He did not refuse to give the doubting Thomas the proof for which he asked, but He reminded him that there was a higher, a more spiritual stage of faith which he had failed to reach. *Because thou hast seen Me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed.*⁴

What is the lesson of the miracles of Jesus for ourselves, men of a later age, born into a world whose laws we understand so much better than was possible for the saints or the sinners of the first century? It is probable that we shall hear very much less in the future about the impossibility of miracle than our fathers did. We know something now of the vastness and complexity of nature. We may

¹ St. Matt. xii. 39.

² St. John xiv. 11.

³ St. John iv. 49.

⁴ St. John xx. 29.

be entirely convinced that it is governed by laws and not by caprice; but we have learnt to be modest in claiming finality for our definitions of those laws. Quite possibly the miracles of the Gospel may be all susceptible of what we call "natural" explanation, for He whose work they were is Himself the Author of nature and the Source of its teeming life. But however we may explain them, we cannot explain them away without relegating the Jesus of the Gospels to a shadowland of myth and legend, which must soon cease to influence our serious thoughts. It is probable that the evidential value of a recorded miracle is not now what it would have been in the first century, or indeed in any century from the first to the eighteenth. This is, perhaps, not altogether a matter for regret. Men have learnt—and it is well that they should have learnt—to look beyond the sign to the thing signified, and to lay stress upon the latter rather than upon the former. So far, well. But to assert that the inference from the "sign" to the superhuman Power and Wisdom of Him who granted it is always an illogical inference, is to adopt canons of logic which are not only at variance with the consent of Catholic antiquity, but with the theology of the Gospels and with the words of our Lord.

No doubt, different minds will remain to the end differently affected by the simple records of these signs of the Christ. They will not convince us of His mission, of His present power to help and to console, if we begin by scrutinizing them and the evidence for them for the sole purpose of gratifying our intellectual curiosity. Nor will they seem very significant to us, if we have not schooled ourselves to obey those voices of truth, of purity, of righteousness, which are ever, through God's mercy, ringing in our ears. *If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.* But to him who is struggling, however falteringly, to follow in the steps of the world's

Master, these long past signs of His power and His pity will seem to be reflected in the grace which He still offers to those who have their faces set towards the heavenly way. They will no longer seem a cruel tax upon faith; they will be recognised as the signs of a Deliverer who can now as of old deliver from all that is base and cowardly and impure. And though we may not see them with our outward eyes, yet we are content that it should be so. The strongest faith seeks no sign, for it has the assurance of personal devotion, of grace given and received. We shall seek no sign, but the sign of the power of the risen Lord, who left that parting legacy of beatitude to His Church, *Blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed.*

J. H. BERNARD.

THE FUTURE OF THE KINGDOM.

A GREAT deal has been made of the distinction between two conceptions of the Kingdom which some find in the teaching of Jesus. On the one hand, a certain class of writers hold that during the earlier period of His ministry Jesus proclaimed the Kingdom of God as a present good to be consummated in this world. On the other hand, stress is laid on the eschatological nature of the Kingdom as a blessing to be bestowed in the future. Neither opinion gives a complete or correct interpretation of the gospel narratives. Jesus applies the term Kingdom of God to a condition of life partly present, but ideally complete only in the future, though His most frequent reference in the employment of the term is to the progress of the Gospel in this world. Indeed, except for a few obvious cases of what may be called the transcendental Kingdom, we are safe in interpreting it of the life of the Christian society here on earth.

When we speak of the future, we may have one or other of two quite different ideas. We may mean the life of humanity, including of course individuals on this earth; or the hereafter, when our world has come to an end. This distinction is usually denoted in writings of the New Testament by the words *ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος* and *ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων*—a usage sanctioned by Jesus Himself. In the synoptic gospels Jesus, when setting forth the nature of the Kingdom of God, refers almost entirely to the former of these two periods. His instruction as to the future world-age is much less full. It is sufficiently detailed, however, for us to recognise that the future Kingdom will differ widely from that which is at present working itself out on earth. In Matthew xix. 28 it is termed the *παλιγγενεσία*—the renovated world. What is told us of the new order is highly figurative. It will be a condition of spiritual fellowship when the patriarchs shall appear (Luke xiii. 28, Matt. viii. 11) and Israel shall be complete. It will be the ideal condition of humanity. Not that it will be in any way a development from the present. Our world is to be transfigured, renewed by a divine act, which will bring to an end the period of struggle and inaugurate the new age. For the Kingdom as we now know it men strive, suffer, endure reproach, work to win it as a moral blessing. The future comes to them with attainment, glory, rest. These two æons are separated by the coming of the Son of Man. When He appears, the Kingdom as a sphere, in which human life, with its stress of winning good in the face of evil, its triumph over obstacles, temptation, failure, defeat, is closed, to be succeeded at the end of all things worldly by a new and glorious era ushered in by His manifestation. Such also in general was the belief of the Apostolic Church.

In the Synoptists the term Kingdom of God is a description of blessings for the individual as well as for an

aggregate membership, so that it is necessary to consider whether instruction and warnings as to the future are meant for the individual or for the Church itself. The Coming of the Son of Man is the moment when the present age closes and the old order of the Kingdom changes. In the case of the individual this change comes at death (Luke xii. 40). For the race the change will be when the Son of Man appeareth to wind up the present system. Three distinct applications of the term Kingdom being therefore possible, *i.e.*, to the individual, the Church in this world, or the ideal future, we must carefully consider in each case whether Jesus is speaking of the fortunes of definite persons before Him, or of the wider history of the Church on earth, or of the Coming Age.

1. It will be well to refer very briefly to what Jesus says of the future of the individual member of the Kingdom. This is to be gathered chiefly from parables, *e.g.*, Matthew xxiv. 42-51, xxv. 1-30; Luke xii. 16-48. In none of these parables is the advent of the Son of Man said to be with glory. This expression is reserved for the final display to the wondering universe. But since at his death every one is just as really face to face with the Son of Man as the world will be at its close, His word of warning for all is, Watch. The Lord may appear at any moment, and the Kingdom has come for those to whom He is made manifest.

We have to explain the frequent warnings to watchfulness and to preparedness, which consist in doing faithfully the duties of an ordinary life, along with the distinct evidence that Jesus looked for a prolonged future for His Church on earth. While, of course, the Church also must be watchful and obedient, yet the emphasis to look for His final coming cannot be till the preparatory conditions are fulfilled, and for that reason it is better to interpret these parables of the experience of the individual, especially as at that time they applied more exactly to definite persons

than to the final coming for the establishment of the Kingdom in glory. Nearly all Christ's teaching as to the Kingdom holds true of the individual, inasmuch as the life of God in the individual is the Kingdom in miniature. Paul also states in Ephesians that each individual will move in the perfect rhythm of the final organism of perfect man, humanity, with its head Christ. Hence we need not be surprised that it is often difficult to say when Christ is referring distinctly to the individual or to the Church, *e.g.* Luke xii.

The keynote of the above passages is, Watch. His disciples are servants with assigned duties, posts to keep, tasks to perform, not knowing when their Lord will come to receive their account of faithful and just work. In the Gospel of John, Jesus also tells His orphaned children to obey the commands of their Lord in a life of loving service towards one another till the day when He will return to take them to Himself. We receive from the gospels the uniform impression that Jesus constantly instilled into the minds of His followers that they might look for their Lord at any moment, lest, like the foolish virgins, they should allow the drowsiness of a life in this world so to overcome them that they would be taken at unawares.

2. (a) In accordance with His general purpose of devoting Himself especially to the education of the apostles, Jesus gave most of His attention to the future of His Church as represented immediately by the Twelve. Of the distant future He has less to say, His method being to instruct those sent forth by Himself, allowing the Holy Spirit to direct the expanding Church in her new experience. So much so indeed does the immediate future of the Church and of individual members of His personal retinue loom up in His vision of the coming days, that the distant ages are but as a fringe to His picture of the nearer years.

This was partly due to the fact that the new experience

of persecution would prove more dangerous to the young and untried life of the Church than any that might follow when its strength had grown more stalwart. But especially because Jesus, while dealing with men who had a definite trial to face in a strange future for which they required nerve, could in His instructions to them leave guidance for His Church, His exhortations at once serving an immediate purpose, and being the normal encouragement for every other day of trouble yet to come.

The apostles were Jews surrounded by influences emanating from Jerusalem. This gives local colour to the warnings of the Gospels, John as well as the Synoptist. It is probable that Jesus did not devote much of His teaching to the future outlook of the Kingdom till He had turned His face to Jerusalem, for the arrangement of Matthew's material, which might seem to show otherwise, really affords no secure marks of time. According to Mark viii.-ix. 1, the reference to the future experience of His disciples is first coupled with the announcement of His own death. They must follow the road He travelled, take up their cross, acknowledge Him in a sinful and adulterous generation, even should it lead to loss of earthly life, rather than, by disowning His name, add a few years to their worldly existence and lose their own souls. Indeed, He continues with emphasis, the lot of some present before Him will be that they shall not taste death till they see the Kingdom of God coming with power. According to the analogy of New Testament usage, to taste of death cannot be a somewhat insipid term for expressing ordinary decease, but it implies that the cup will be bitter; and the connection shows that it is closely related to the coming of the Kingdom with power. The obvious similarity between ix. 1 and the foregoing suggests that Jesus intended to teach His followers that some of them must share His fate, being doomed to martyrdom just by reason of the great and successful ser-

vice they are to render to the Kingdom. This we know to have been verified by history, for, though there may have been others present besides the apostles, yet it was mainly to them that these words were addressed. And, in all probability, most of them suffered death in persecutions that were intensified by the very progress of apostolic missions.

A general idea of the teaching of Jesus as to the future of His disciples, exclusive of that in the great synoptical discourses, can be formed by comparing Matthew x. 16-end, Luke xii. 2-12, Luke xvii. 20-23. In Matthew x. it is difficult to determine exactly how much treats of the mission of the Twelve in Galilee and how much of the more distant future, though we may take as a standard that it is improbable that on their first missionary journeys in Galilee they had to suffer the extremity of distress here depicted. Persecution will arise as the progress of the Gospel excites bitter opposition. Its small beginnings spoken in secret will soon be proclaimed from the housetops. Families will be divided. There will be tumults and wars. The disciples will suffer chiefly at the hands of their own countrymen, the Jews, who will drag them before courts and heathen tribunals. Then will be the danger of apostasy. The Holy Spirit will be their power; but if they are untrue to His witness, and are ashamed to confess that their Lord is the Messiah, they will be guilty of an unpardonable sin. In the midst of all this turmoil they must cling to their posts, invest their talents, be faithful to their trusts.

Jesus forewarns His disciples of the very evils that threaten the churches to which the author of Hebrews, 1 Peter, and James write. The word, *My Lord delayeth His coming*, will be in many a mouth. Arrogance, worldliness, vice, will encrust and corrode a faith which will thus be in danger of snapping in the storm and stress of perse-

cution. How vividly Jesus had this before His mind is measured by the strenuous terms in which He speaks of it. Days will come when they will long for one of the days of the Son of Man to relieve them from their strain, but in vain (Luke xvii. 22). Their rest is not yet.

His most explicit warnings, those of the great discourses in Matthew xxiv., Mark xiii., Luke xxi., are uttered in Jerusalem, the centre of the woe to come. Jesus the true Hebrew had read from the beginning the tragedy of His city and His people. On that day when His righteous zeal for the sacredness of His nation's worship was faced by the stolid demand for a sign of His authority (John ii. 19), He had traced the beginning of a hatred that would do Him to death, but also drag Jerusalem and its temple to their fall. How intense is the pathos of a patriot weeping over the city, and bidding her daughters lament for themselves! Was there ever sorrow like to His sorrow, Who, as He looked on Jerusalem, the joy of all the earth and the glory of Mount Zion, which had been sung with transport for generations, knew that part of the tragedy of His death was that it marked the doom of a spot most sacred to Him of all on earth, and crowded with holy memories? Yet this was His choice in the desert some years before.

He reiterates constantly that the breach between His followers and the Jews must widen, and that the former must not entangle themselves in the destruction of the city. There is no promise given of any special help at that time, as though the Son of man would appear to succour His followers. The one warning is to escape with all haste. Vivid as is the description of the impending ruin it is by no means an exact detail of what happened, a proof in itself that the narrative was not composed *ex eventu*. A note in the Gospel of Mark repeated in Matthew, which probably belongs to the original stratum of our Gospels, runs, Let him that readeth understand, as though added in after

years to warn the Christians that the foretold storm is gathering.

In Matthew xxiv. there are two questions asked, for the fact that the article is not repeated seems to show that the evangelist connected the Parousia with the completion of the world-age. The first was almost as important a question for those disciples as the second, inasmuch as the Fall of Jerusalem, though not introducing a new epoch in church life, delivered the Christians from much suffering and was an objective proof that the old dispensation was at an end. It is not very difficult to separate the material of the replies to the two questions, which run side by side. Matthew xxiv. 4-13, 15-26, 32-35 deal with the future of the Church in the years that culminate in the ruin of the Jewish capital.

Notwithstanding the difficulty of determining the limits of the figurative in the discourses of Jesus we can get a generally consistent meaning for these verses. Times of great distress are approaching when the Christian name will be universally hated. Sin and lawlessness will increase and the love of many wax cold. Believers will be in danger of being led astray by false Christs, a prophecy evidently fulfilled in those false teachers, who in the time of Paul, and later of John, were to be by their spirit incarnations of Antichrist. Under the Jews growing in arrogance persecution will become intense. Wars, tumults, the very forces of nature, will seem to be in league for their ruin. But let them not succumb to alarm. As surely as summer is nigh when the fig-tree puts forth her leaves, so certainly do these things portend the ruin of the city, all prophecy to the contrary notwithstanding. But when the Gentile army occupies and so desecrates what was once the Holy City, that is the sign for them to flee with a haste so urgent as to render unnecessary their religious duties. So powerful will be the wickedness of that time that to shield the

elect from the danger of apostasy the cataclysm of the nation will come with a fell swoop (v. 22).

From these descriptions we see how Jesus bore on His heart the terrible time of sifting that was awaiting His Church, when physical suffering, however severe, would be aggravated by the danger of spiritual declension through error, false doctrine, worldliness—precisely the temptations against which Paul in his later letters and John in anguish of soul warn their readers.

Jerusalem fallen, persecution is over, and His followers have rest. But let them not think that in all this the Son of man has yet appeared (Matt. xxiv. 26, 27).

(b) Having seen that Jesus does not connect His second coming at all with the destruction of Jerusalem, we shall proceed to arrange the hints that He gives as to the future progress of the Kingdom in the world, apart from its experiences with the Jewish people.

We have not space to discuss the parables which set forth the comparatively slow development of the Kingdom, such as, *e.g.*, the parable of the sower, one of the objects of which is to warn the disciples that they must not expect too much from enthusiasm, and that the Kingdom will not be accepted permanently and at once by all.

Several sayings of Jesus suggest that He expected a long future for this earth. When the Pharisees ask Him (Luke xvii. 20) when the Kingdom will come, doubtless having in mind their apocalyptic hopes, He replies that it will spread in an unobtrusive way in the hearts of men. His farewell injunction to His followers is, "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations." We have a difficult verse (Matt. x. 23) in which Jesus tells them, "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come," a statement that at first sight seems to point to an appearing of the Lord in that generation. What does our Lord mean by the cities of Israel? It can hardly be taken in a literal

sense, as is shown by Matthew xix. 28, Luke xxii. 29, 30, where the twelve apostles are promised authority in the Kingdom over the twelve tribes of Israel, *i.e.* the Christian Church in its ideal form. So this passage should probably be interpreted as meaning, when persecution comes, you are not to remain in Jerusalem nor in any other place to court destruction, but the gospel must be carried elsewhere. Persecution will not wipe you out of existence, nor until the final appearance of the Lord will there cease to be a place of refuge for the missionaries of the Cross. In the same chapter Jesus, while forbidding His disciples to go to the Gentiles during His life-time, warns them that days will come when they shall be brought before heathen rulers for testifying of His gospel to the nations.

Mark xiii. 10, Matthew xxiv. 14 has often been misinterpreted to give an approximate date to a period which Jesus expressly leaves undetermined. The verse simply points to the fact that the gospel of Jesus is for humanity, that all men will be judged by it, and that therefore the final issue, which involves this judgment, cannot come before the race has made full trial of the teaching of our Lord.

Jesus looks to a future of the Kingdom on earth very similar to the fortunes of the early years—silent growth, much persecution, spiritual accomplishment in the hearts of men. He never indicates that in this present order of things His gospel will so captivate the hearts of men, that by the ordinary development of moral human life this world in which we live will be transformed into the final Kingdom of God.

3. Indeed, before the appearing of the Son of man the progress of the Kingdom will seem to be retarded by a degeneracy setting in during the last days of the world of such crass materialism that as in the times of Noah and of Lot it will be difficult for even the few righteous to escape.

The synoptic discourses connect the final event with a time of great tribulation, and in Luke xviii. 7, 8, Jesus seems to be in doubt as to whether the Son of man will find faith on the earth at His coming.

When night is darkest dawn breaks, and the glory of the new day of the Son of man shall be revealed with transcendent grandeur, and swift as lightning from the sky (Luke xvii. 24-37). Men will be taken at unawares, surprised in the ordinary duties of their life, those in whom the Kingdom had come without observation leaving their old home to be gathered into the train of the Son of man, their neighbours, fathers, brothers, it may be, abandoned to the ruin of the world now breaking upon them as the prelude to the fearful impending judgment. The wheat and the tares are ripe for the harvest, which is gathered in as the Son of man appears. In the final judgment the latent principles of life will be made manifest, to be judged by simple lines of conduct according to the standard of human duty embodied in the Son of man (Matt. xxv. 31-46). Coincident with this is the close of the present system described in the three Synoptists, Mark xiii., Matthew xxiv., Luke xxi., in figurative language derived largely from Old Testament conceptions of the Day of the Lord. Of that final day and hour knoweth no man, and curious enquiry as to its season is forbidden.

A distinctive phraseology is employed to express this final event. It is the *παρουσία, ἀποκάλυψις*, the Coming of the Son of man with power, or glory, or on clouds of heaven. The language and symbolism will not admit of its being identified with the coming of the Paraclete promised in the Johannine discourses, which finds its synoptic parallel in the promise of the risen Saviour, "Lo, I am with you always." Many critics maintain that the whole description of the future as given in the Synoptists is coloured by current ideas of the Jewish apocalypses, a short

one indeed, it is said, being embodied in our sources.¹ Without discussing what I think will soon be regarded as one of the curiosities of literary criticism, it is sufficient to say that unless we wish to make the Gospels absurd, it will be impossible to interpret literally much of the discourse of Jesus. He spoke to orientals in pictures, but even as He transformed in adopting from Daniel the term Son of man, we must also give a spiritual interpretation to the imagery which He borrowed from the Old Testament.

The final grand pictures in Matthew xiii., xxiv., xxv. of the old world and its freight of sinful men being swept off to its own place, from which the tumult can never disturb the peace of the redeemed, and the universe sinking into ruins as the very stars of heaven go out in blackness, are relieved from the desolation of silent night by new heavens descending with the fresh beauty of the ideal apostolic Church, in the midst of which the glorified Son of man appears in power (Matt. xix., xxiv.).

R. A. FALCONER.

¹ Pfeiderer, Weizsäcker, Holtzmann. For a discussion of the subject see Haupt's *Die eschatologischen Aussagen Jesu*, to which I am much indebted.

A CRITICISM OF THE NEW CHRONOLOGY OF PAUL.

II.

WE have seen that the positive argument of O. Holtzmann is worthless.¹ Those of Harnack and McGiffert, in so far as they rest upon it, must of course be equally so. But is Holtzmann's negative argument trustworthy, which dismisses as unavailable all other synchronisms than his own? for herein he is again followed by Harnack and McGiffert. If so, then we have no more to do than simply to weigh the authority of Eusebius in the form of text established by Harnack against the objections of Lightfoot, Schürer and others and decide accordingly. If, however, we are convinced, with Ramsay, that there is light to be had from the synchronisms of the older chronographers, when properly employed, our decision may be modified, or even wholly determined by these.

A synchronism, for example, which might well seem utterly fatal to the Eusebian chronology, is that of 2 Corinthians xi. 32, 33, taken together with Acts ix. 23-25 and Galatians i. 18, and adjusted to the known facts regarding Aretas IV., surnamed עֲרֵם רְחֵם = Φιλόλαος, king of the Nabateans, who reigned from B.C. 9 till A.D. 40. As to these facts we cannot do better than to transcribe from the careful excursus of Schürer (*l.c.* I. ii. p. 357) on the History of the Nabatean Kings: "From the long reign of Aretas only a few incidents belonging to its latest period have come down to us. The tetrarch Herod Antipas had

¹ Since the MS. of the preceding article left my hands I have found a review of Harnack's *Chronologie* by Prof. Christie in the current (September) number of *The New World*, and one of McGiffert's "Apostolic Age," by Prof. Shailer Mathews in that of *The Biblical World* (November, 1897), which offer criticisms in a measure coincident with my own upon the new chronology.

a daughter of Aretas for his wife, and her he subsequently divorced in order to marry Herodias. The enmity occasioned thereby between the two princes was further inflamed by disputes regarding boundaries. An open conflict followed, in which the army of Herod was defeated by the troops of Aretas. Owing to his having proceeded at his own instance, Aretas was to have been chastised by the governor Vitellius at the instigation of the Emperor Tiberius. But when Vitellius, on his march against Petra, received in Jerusalem the tidings of the death of Tiberius he turned back, leaving his task unperformed (*Antiq.* xviii. 5, 1 and 3). These events, therefore, belong to the latest years of the reign of Tiberius, A.D. 36-37. At a period not much later occurred Paul's flight from Damascus, at which time Damascus was under a governor (*ἐθνάρχης*) of King Aretas (2 Cor. xi. 32). We learn from this statement that now again Damascus belonged to the domain of the Arabian king. This is also confirmed by the fact that from the time of Caligula and Claudius no coins of Damascus are known having the image of the Roman emperor. Probably Caligula, who was induced to the performance of such acts of grace,¹ had restored the city to Aretas." The concluding sentence implies acceptance of the verdict of Wieseler (*Chron. d. Apost. Zeitalt.* pp. 167 ff.) upon the theory of Heyne (*De ethnarcha Aretas Arabum regis*, 1755), still maintained by Hausrath (*Ntl. Ztgesch.* Bd. II. p. 209), that Aretas actually took Damascus out of Roman control by force. But one can hardly read Wieseler's discussion and not agree with Schürer (*l.c.* p. 358) that any theory of Aretas' occupation of Damascus by force is "very improbable. . . . Such an attack upon Roman territory

¹ He was very friendly to Agrippa, who in turn was on the worst of terms with his brother-in-law, the adulterer and murderer Antipas. Vitellius also, if we may trust Josephus, was only too glad to be quit of the uncongenial task of delivering the detestable sycophant Antipas from the just vengeance of his injured father-in-law.

could not have been left unheeded. The coins of Damascus with the image of Tiberius come down to the year A.D. 33-34; those of Nero begin with the year A.D. 62-63. In the interval Damascus may have been in the possession of the Arabian king." But such a change in the last years of Tiberius at the very time of Vitellius' mission to the East (A.D. 35) is very improbable, and of course out of the question in A.D. 36, when Aretas was already in arms against Antipas in practical rebellion against Rome. The earliest date at all probable for the occupation of Damascus by Aretas is the reign of Caligula (March A.D. 37 to January A.D. 41), more exactly A.D. 38, when Iturea Libani was given to Soemus, Armenia Minor and some parts of Arabia to Cotys, parts of Thrace which had belonged to Cotys to Rometalces, and Pontus, Colchis and Bosphorus to Polemo II. (See Lewin, *Fasti Sacri*, p. 256, § 1533; and Dion, lix. 12.)

Aretas, therefore, was probably not in control of Damascus before the latter part of 38 A.D.¹ But according to Acts ix. 22-26, compared with Galatians i. 18 and 2 Corinthians xi. 32, 33, this cannot have been more than three years after Paul's conversion, and to place the conversion so late as 35-36 A.D. is fatal to the Eusebian chronology.

The objection, however, is dismissed by Holtzmann and his followers as insignificant. According to the former (*l.c.* p. 97) "the expression ἡ πόλις Δαμασκηνῶν in 1 Corinthians xi. 32 seems to hint at autonomy. Again Paul goes away from Damascus to Arabia, and returns thence to Damascus

¹ No aid is afforded by the Damascus coin inscribed ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ . ΑΡΕΤΟΥ . ΦΙΛΕΛΛΗΝΟΣ with the date ΑΡ=101; for the title Φιλέλληνας is incompatible with רחם עמיה (=Φιλέλαος), which was that of Aretas IV. The note in Schürer, div. I. vol. ii. Appendix ii. 11, is misleading through an inversion of the facts. By some oversight the inscription on the coin is said to be רחם עמיה. If this were so, the coin would belong to Aretas IV.; but it is certainly of Aretas III., i.e., Φιλέλληνας, as Schürer rightly maintains.

(Gal. i. 17), so that Damascus does not belong to Arabia." The ἐθνάρχης Ἀρέτα τοῦ βασιλέως is therefore in Holtzmann's view only "the representative of Arabian interests in Damascus appointed by Aretas." Opinions will doubtless differ as to the likelihood of the supposition that an appointee of Aretas corresponding to the modern consul could "guard the city of the Damascenes," while it was under Roman control, in order to prevent the egress of a Roman citizen. Until there is a more unanimous consent to it than at present, Holtzmann's reply to the objection must be regarded as inadequate.

The case is different with the supposition of Weizsäcker (*Apost. Zeitalter*,² p. 81,¹ Engl. transl. p. 98), made without any consideration of possible chronological inferences, that the escape from Damascus of 2 Corinthians xi. 32 marks neither the beginning (Hausrath), nor the end of the three-years period of Galatians i. 18, but rather the violent end of the first half of another period, viz., that of Paul's missionary activity "in the regions of Syria and Cilicia" (Gal. i. 21). During his evangelistic work "in Syria," before going to Tarsus (Acts xi. 25), Damascus, the scene of Paul's earliest preaching, would naturally be his base of operations, where under Roman control he would be safe. But when *circa* 39 A.D. the city passed under the control of Aretas, Jewish opposition (cf. 1 Thess. ii. 15), exerted through the Jewish ethnarch appointed by Aretas, would be able to drive Paul out if not to kill him. His escape will then have been wrongly dated by the author of Acts ix. 23-25. If its proper position is after Galatians i. 18, we may cease to wonder that in Galatians i. 17

¹ There is an unexplained contradiction between copies of the "second edition" printed in 1890, p. 83, which place the escape of Paul in the three-year period of Galatians i. 18, and copies of the "second edition" printed in 1892, which place the escape during a *second* visit of Paul to Damascus, during the period of his activity "in the regions of Syria and Cilicia" (Gal. i. 21).

Damascus should be spoken of as no part of Arabia and the motive for the visit to Jerusalem as simply *ἱστορήσαι Κηφᾶν*, since the city was not as yet "under Aretas the king." The objection that Acts ix. 23-25 places the escape before the visit to Jerusalem is not serious, since this author is certainly at fault in regard to the whole period in question; not only *uninformed* as to Paul's earlier career, but positively *misinformed* as to Paul's activity in Damascus and visit to Jerusalem, the latter being placed by him so soon after the conversion that the disciples in Jerusalem have not yet heard of it when Paul arrives. The difficulty of placing the escape from Damascus earlier than *circa* 39 A.D. will therefore perhaps outweigh the testimony of this author, who places it, be it observed, *immediately* after Paul's conversion, apparently unaware of any other time when Paul could have been labouring in Damascus. If so, this obstacle to the Eusebian dating will really disappear, though not as Holtzmann proposes. As the reign of Aretas IV. does not extend beyond A.D. 40, Paul's escape, and perhaps the end of his missionary career "in the region of Syria," might therefore even be positively dated A.D. 39 or 40; but this date, unfortunately, would have no determining effect upon the relative chronology, falling as it does at an indefinite time between the first and second visits to Jerusalem spoken of in Galatians.

The same must be said of the synchronism of the death of Agrippa I. That it occurred in the summer of 44 A.D. is certain. This was before the famine in Judæa, for the Phœnician coast was still dependent as ever on the *hinterland* for its supplies of grain (Acts xii. 20). The martyrdom of James the son of Zebedee and imprisonment of Peter may therefore be dated in the early months of the same year. But the general phrase *κατ' ἐκείνον δὲ τὸν καιρὸν* (Acts xii. 1), which connects the story chronologically with the account in xi. 27-30, xii. 25 of the famine-relief visit of

Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, is too vague to make it of much practical worth for the life of Paul. The indefiniteness of the writer's chronological information is apparent from the statement that the famine predicted by Agabus took place "in the days of Claudius" (A.D. 41-54). We only know from the statements of Josephus (*Ant.* iii. 15, 3; xx. 2, 5 and 5, 2) and Orosius (vii. 6) that the famine cannot have begun before the fall of 45 A.D., and it is probable that the prediction of Agabus was made in that year after the failure of the fall rains, for a failure of the fall rains invariably entails such results. The height of the famine, during which the *διακονία* of Paul and Barnabas will have taken place (see Ramsay, *Paul the Traveller*, chapter iii.) may have been during the winter of 46-47, or even 47-48 A.D., but cannot well have been earlier. This again is undoubtedly a valuable datum; but until the apparent denial of such a visit to Jerusalem as that of Acts xi. 27-30, xii. 25 is removed from Galatians i. 17-ii. 10, it cannot be used in determining the chronology of Paul's life.

It would seem necessary, therefore, to concede to the supporters of the Eusebian chronology that the attempted synchronisms from Paul's escape from Damascus and from the famine-relief visit to Jerusalem are here inapplicable. But Prof. Ramsay is convinced that the same cannot be said of the date given by Orosius (*Hist.* vii. 6), on the authority of a no longer extant passage of Josephus, for the edict of Claudius referred to in Acts xvii. 2. Paul's first arrival in Corinth must be placed after—but only shortly after (*προσφάτως*)—this edict. According to Holtzmann the authority of Orosius, who dates it "in the ninth year of Claudius," is too slight to enable us to say more than that the edict belongs somewhere between A.D. 44 and 50, when Claudius' attitude toward the Jews was hostile. But Ramsay (*EXPOSITOR*, vol. v. p. 208) has shown that,

excepting the error of dating the accession of Claudius in A.U.C. 795 (= A.D. 42), Orosius' dates for this reign are correct; so that Orosius' real date for the edict is A.D. 50, to which we must grant as much weight as his general authority permits; for the *fact* of the edict is witnessed to by both Suetonius and Dion.¹ We must therefore allow this item of positive testimony—whatever its worth—for the year 50 as that of Paul's arrival in Corinth, as against 49 (Holtzmann 48), which the Eusebian reckoning requires.

Another synchronism, which, according to Ramsay, bears with some weight in the same direction against the Eusebian reckoning, is the accession of Gallio to the proconsulship of Achaia, something over a year, as we should infer from Acts xviii. 11-18, after Paul's arrival in Corinth. On account of the probability that Gallio's career of promotion in office was arrested during the exile of his younger brother Seneca, it is commonly assumed that Gallio's proconsulship could not have begun earlier than A.D. 50, "probably in May" (Ramsay); for Seneca's exile lasted until A.D. 49. A further indication is found by Ramsay (*l.c.* p. 206) in the fact that Seneca's treatise *On Anger* was addressed to his brother under his original name, Novatus, implying that at that time he had not yet been adopted by the wealthy Gallio the elder. But Lehmann,² according to Ramsay, has made it very probable that the treatise *On Anger* was written by Seneca after his return to Rome. "It is there-

¹ Dion does not deny the edict, as is sometimes stated, but only that it went to the extent of an actual banishment. Herein he is doubtless right, for so radical a measure, even if undertaken, cannot have been actually carried out. The edict may have been modified from this form into that which Dion represents, of a mere prohibition of assembling in the synagogues. This testimony, however, as being independent of Suetonius, is all the more valuable to prove that there was an actual edict hostile to the Jews at about this time, which is not to be explained away as a mere misinterpretation of the edict spoken of by Tacitus, against the *mathematici*, in A.D. 52. See Dion, ix. 6; Suet. *Claud.* 25; Tac. *Annal.* xii. 52.

² *Claudius und seine Zeit*, pp. 315 ff. See Ramsay, *l.c.* p. 206, note.

fore probable that the adoption did not take place earlier than A.D. 49, too late for the newly-adopted son to go as governor to Achaia in that year.”¹ With this reinforcement from the date of the treatise *On Anger*, the synchronism from the appointment of Gallio must be admitted to be of value, against Holtzmann and McGiffert, in determining the first arrival of Paul in Corinth as *not earlier* than the beginning of A.D. 49. Harnack’s dating would, of course, be still admissible.

But the argument for a later date than the Eusebian, which to Prof. Ramsay seems “conclusive,” is the reference by the chiliarch in Acts xxi. 38 to the revolt of the Sicarii under the “Egyptian.” That “the Sicarii did not arise till the reign of Nero” is an overstatement of the case from Josephus (*Ant.* xx. 8, 5), where their origin is merely traced to the misrule of Felix, at least as probably in the latter years of Claudius. It should be remembered, moreover, that Josephus misapprehends the period of Felix’s activity, placing it too exclusively under Nero.² But while there is no reason in *Ant.* xx. 8, 5 for saying “the Sicarii did not arise till the reign of Nero” it is doubtless the intention of Josephus in xx. 8, 6, κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν καιρὸν, to date the appearance of the Egyptian “false prophet” under Nero; so that unless Josephus is singularly in error, or the author of Acts guilty of a slight anachronism in the speech put in the mouth of the chiliarch, the Pentecost of Paul’s arrest cannot have been earlier than 55 A.D. Prof. Ramsay “would be glad to know how Prof. Harnack would dispose of this difficulty.” We cannot answer, of course, for Harnack, but inasmuch as we must pronounce a judgment on the validity or invalidity of the objection to the Eusebian reckoning we assume that the Eusebian chronologists would either, with Jerome, impute an implied ana-

¹ Expos. v. 5, p. 206.

² See the preceding article, vol. vii. p. 135, and Article III.

chronism to Josephus by dating the revolt of the Egyptian under Claudius;¹ or with Harnack, who seems to admit at least the possibility that the revolt took place under Nero (*l.c.* p. 236), impute an explicit anachronism to the author of Acts. In view of Acts v. 36, 37 there is nothing impossible in the latter supposition, any more than in the former; but in the absence of proof either imputation is inadmissible. We have here a second² instance of testimony which requires to be set aside before the Eusebian chronology, as it stands, can be adopted. The testimony is not unimpeachable, but until it is invalidated it calls upon us in each case to bring down the dating of Eusebius by at least one year.

The negative argument of Holtzmann and his followers must be admitted to be inadequate in at least three particulars, two of which apply also to Eusebius. This we must grant to Prof. Ramsay. But Prof. Ramsay's own chronology is not based on a mere rebuttal of the Eusebian, and a falling back upon the older view of Lightfoot and Schürer. On the contrary, he has struck out a line for himself, reverting to what may be called the "calendar" argument of Wurm and Anger, Wieseler and Lewin.³

The calendar argument, so far as it applies to the chronology of Paul, depends mainly on the passage Acts xx. 6-13, where we learn that Paul sailed from Troas on a Monday

¹ So Blass (*Acta*, p. 22), who calls this "alterum indiligentiæ Josephi specimen." McGiffert (*l.c.* p. 358): "Josephus' apparent ignorance touching Felix's presence and authority in Palestine before the year 52 probably explains the fact that he relates most of the deeds which he ascribes to Felix, including his victory over the Egyptian referred to in Acts xxi. 38, in connection with the reign of Nero."

² In the case of Holtzmann and McGiffert a third.

³ See the articles by the elder Wurm in Bengel's *Archiv für die Theologie*, II. (1816-1817), *Astronomische Beiträge*, pp. 1-39 and 261-313; and by the younger in *Tübinger Ztschr. f. Th.*, 1833, I. pp. 3-103; Anger's pamphlet *De Temporum in Actis Apost. Ratione*, Lips., 1833; Wieseler, *Chronol. Synopse d. Vier Evangelien* (Engl. transl. by Venables, 1864), and *Chronol. d. Apg.*, 1848; also Lewin, *Fasti Sacri*, London, 1865.

morning after having spent "seven days" in Troas, and five on the journey thither from Philippi, which he left *μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν ἀζύμων*. Assuming that there was no delay about the departure—and Paul "was hastening (v. 16) if it were possible for him to be at Jerusalem the day of Pentecost"—Paul must have left Philippi on the 22 Nisan, though Wieseler (*Apg.* pp. 99–115) thinks it possible, if not probable, that the departure did not take place till the twenty-third. Ramsay's understanding of the passage, in which he not only insists that the 22 Nisan must have been the day of departure from Philippi, against Wieseler, but maintains, in opposition to all the older exponents of this argument, including his principal authority Lewin, that in both the five-days and seven-days period *both termini* must be counted, in accordance with the general practice of antiquity and that of the author of Acts himself, is probably correct. Thus the day of Paul's arrival in Troas was probably the 26 Nisan in the year in question; and if there were no further ambiguity of the text, and it were also possible to establish astronomically from the incidence of Passover on what day of the week in any given year A.D. 53–60 the 26 Nisan fell, it is clear we might establish a reasonable probability in favour of certain of these years and against others. Unfortunately Prof. Ramsay is himself obliged to admit an ambiguity of the text, inasmuch as the author may or may not have counted the Monday of departure among the "seven" days of Paul's stay in Troas. If he followed the current Macedonian reckoning from sunrise to sunrise, he could not have included it, nor would he be likely to if he followed the Roman Civil Day from midnight to midnight, for the ship sailed at dawn, or earlier, and to speak of the period from some time on Tuesday till some time between midnight and dawn the next Monday morning as "seven days" seems forced. If, however, he reckoned according to the

Greek and Hebrew Sacred Day from sunset to sunset, he might count the portion of Monday as the seventh day of Paul's stay.

But in addition there is unfortunately a very serious error in Lewin's determination of the incidence of Passover, which Prof. Ramsay seems not to have observed. His authority is in fact most misleading in this respect, and needs to be corrected by the careful researches of the astronomer Wurm. The error of Lewin, for whose otherwise admirable work we share the respect of Prof. Ramsay, lies in his attempt to make the Passover full moon (astronomic) "the pivot of the whole year" (*l.c.* p. xxxvi.). It is perfectly manifest on the contrary that even if it were possible, or permissible, for the priests to fix the date of the (astronomic) full moon of Nisan, this would be of no service for those who on the tenth (Exod. xii. 3) must have the passover lamb ready, on the thirteenth must "purge out the old leaven," and in the afternoon of the fourteenth must have the lamb slaughtered (Philo, *de Septen.*, § 18; Jos., *Bell.* vi. 9, 3). Especially would it be impossible for Jews at a distance from Jerusalem, like Paul, to know anything of these vitally important dates unless first the New Year's Day of 1 Nisan had been fixed. Who can read the Book of Jubilees or the Talmudic treatise *Rosh ha-Shanah*, or even Exodus xii. 1-6, and not see that the "pivot of the whole calendar" is, of necessity, not the *full* moon of Nisan,¹ but the *new* moon of Nisan, the observation of which had to be certified by witnesses before the Sanhedrin, and was therefore proclaimed far and wide, at first by fire signals, afterwards by special messengers despatched from Jerusalem.

How then was the *Rosh ha-Shanah*, New Year's Day, or 1 Nisan determined? "Unless all indications are deceitful,

¹ Philo in the passages cited by Lewin is not speaking of the *astronomic* full moon, or "opposition," but merely in the ordinary sense.

they did not in the time of Jesus Christ possess as yet any fixed calendar, but on the basis of a purely empirical observation, on each occasion they began a new month with the appearing of the new moon, and likewise on the basis of each repeated observation intercalated a month in the spring of every third and second year, in accordance with the rule that the Passover under all circumstances must fall after the vernal equinox.”¹ Now the astronomer Wurm (Bengel’s *Archiv.* § 25) has accumulated a mass of testimony, ancient and modern, for solution of the question, “How great an interval must be allowed between true (astronomic) conjunction, when the moon is invisible, and the first observable phasis or appearance of the moon’s disk?” According to the rabbis 27½ hours, at the most, would suffice. Wurm’s conclusion is, however, that even under favourable conditions of weather from twenty-four to forty-eight hours must be allowed, or on the average thirty-six hours between conjunction and visibility. If we reflect that the “witnesses of the moon” had to come to Jerusalem, appear and be examined before the authorities, and that testimony was not received after the hour of evening sacrifice, as leaving too little time for the “sanctification” of the new moon, it will be apparent that we cannot allow less than an average of thirty-six hours between the conjunction and the “sanctification,” even for favourable conditions of weather. But this is just double what Lewin allows uniformly for all cases. At any time, of course, a cloudy sky might produce further delay, although not more than some hours; for the new moon was sanctified, even though no witnesses had appeared, after the preceding month had attained to its fullest complement of thirty days. The rule, therefore, by which our

¹ Schürer, *l.c.* I. ii., p. 366. This whole excursus of Schürer—Appendix III., the Jewish and Macedonian Months compared with the Julian Calendar—with the authorities cited, is of the greatest service.

table of the incidence of Jewish dates must be prepared is that of Wurm: "We must calculate from our astronomical tables for the meridian of Jerusalem, the true astronomical new moon which immediately precedes the spring full moon, *i.e.* the full moon next after the vernal equinox, *i.e.* in the first century, March 23.¹ To the date of the true conjunction, *i.e.* the first new moon, when found, we must add from about twenty-four to forty-eight hours, or on an average a day and a half, and we shall then have determined the ancient Jewish 1 Nisan, after the phasis, *i.e.* after the first appearance of the moon's disk. If to this 1 Nisan fourteen more days are added, we shall reach the 15 Nisan, or the day of the Jewish Easter Festival."²

It is easy to see that Prof. Ramsay's statement (*l.c.* p. 203) that "The one point of uncertainty in the argument [the "calendar" argument] is whether Monday was counted [in Acts xx. 6] as one of the seven days," is, to say the least, an overstatement; and this fact is quite sufficient to account for the otherwise universal neglect into which this once favourite argument has now fallen. Nevertheless, Prof. Ramsay has undoubtedly diminished the ambiguities of the text, and in spite of the lamentable uncertainties of the calendar reckonings, it is possible to frame a table which will include all the reasonable probabilities, though by no means such a table as Lewin and Wieseler afford. We append a table of this character.

In regard to the table given below the following points must be noted in explanation.

1. It includes all the reasonable probabilities. Thus the new moon before the vernal equinox of A.D. 53 was theoretically visible at thirty-five minutes after three o'clock on the afternoon of March 10. This allows

¹ In practice the vernal equinox had been fixed by Julius Cæsar as March 25, and was so reckoned, Plin. *N.H.* xviii. 66, 1.

² Wurm, *l.c.* p. 279.

INCIDENCE OF JEWISH (LUNAR) DATES A.D. 53-50.

A.D.	NEW MOON.		NISAN 1.		NISAN 15.	PAUL IN TROAS.	
	Conjunction.	Phasis.	6 p.m.—6 p.m.	Day of Week.		Nis. 26—Iy. 2 (3).	Nis. 26—Iy. 3 (4).
53	Mar. 9, 3.35 a.m. Apr. 7, 1.56 p.m.	Mar. 10, 3.35 p.m. Apr. 9, 1.56 a.m.	Mar. 10-11 Apr. 9-10	7 3	Mar. 24-25 ¹ Apr. 23-24 ²	Tues.—Mon.	Mon.—Mon.
54	Mar. 28, 1.17 a.m.	Mar. 29, 1.17 p.m.	Mar. 29-30	7	Apr. 12-13		
55	Mar. 17, 6.27 a.m.	Mar. 18, 6.27 p.m.	Mar. 18-19 ¹ 19-30 ³	4 5	Apr. 1-2 2-3		
56	Apr. 15, 9.12 p.m. Mar. 6, 5.34 a.m.	Apr. 17, 9.12 a.m. Mar. 7, 5.34 p.m.	Apr. 17-18 Mar. 7-8 ¹ 8-9 ²	6 2 3	Mar. 1-2 ² Mar. 21-22 22-23	Tues.—Mon.	Mon.—Mon.
57	Apr. 3, 9.54 p.m.	Apr. 5, 9.54 a.m.	Apr. 5-6	3	Apr. 19-20 ³		
58	Mar. 23, 10.47 p.m. Mar. 13, 6.03 a.m.	Mar. 25, 10.47 a.m. Mar. 14, 6.03 p.m.	Mar. 25-26 Mar. 14-15 ¹ 15-16 ³	7 4 5	Apr. 8-9 Mar. 28-29 29-30		
59	Apr. 11, 5.45 p.m. Apr. 1, 4.39 a.m.	Apr. 13, 5.45 a.m. Apr. 2, 4.39 p.m.	Apr. 13-14 Apr. 2-3 ¹ 3-4 ²	6 3 4	Apr. 27-28 ² Apr. 16-17 17-18	Tues.—Mon.	Mon.—Mon.
60	Mar. 20, 8.49 p.m.	Mar. 22, 8.49 a.m.	Mar. 22-23	1	Apr. 5-6		

Besides the authorities above cited I have used in the preparation of this table De Morgan's *Book of Almanacks*, and the table of eclipses of sun and moon given by Lewin (*i.e.* pp. 371-375) from *L'Art de Vérifier les Dates*. The dates of conjunctions of the moon in col. 1 were kindly reckoned for me independently by Prof. W. Beebe of the Astronomical Department of this University from the lunar and solar tables. They may be relied upon as correct for the meridian of Jerusalem within a very few minutes.

The last double column is intended to cover the alternative admitted by Prof. Ramsay that the day of Paul's departure from Troas might have been either the seventh or eighth from his arrival (counting both termini), thus including in the table all possibilities. The "seventh" day from Nisan 26th would be Iyyar 2d or 3d by lunar reckoning, according as Nisan was given 29 or 30 days; but the ambiguity does not affect us, as either is equivalent to Nisan 32d. The "eighth" day similarly would be Iyyar 3d or 4th, but in either case = Nisan 33d. The *terminus ad quem* being fixed as a Monday, the seven days' stay in Troas is not reckoned out for the years in which its terminus would fall on some other week-day.

ample time for the "sanctification" on the same evening, whence the *Rosh ha-Shanah* or New Year's Day would begin. Moreover, it is not likely that it would be delayed another twenty-four hours, even if, through unfavourable weather conditions or other cause, no "witnesses of the moon" appeared; for the conjunction was so much earlier, that the outer limit of thirty days for the preceding month Adar would have been passed in the meantime. On the other hand, to suppose that the new moon was sanctified on the evening of March 9 requires the improbable supposition that the new moon was seen in broad daylight within twelve or fifteen hours after conjunction! But again, the sanctification of this new moon as that of Nisan would bring the Passover to the earliest possible limit, whereas it was not only necessary that it should fall after the equinox, but even more needful that the season should be sufficiently advanced for the gathering of ripe ears of wheat for the sheaf-offering on Nisan 16¹ and this could rarely take place before the first week in April; it is therefore, on the whole, more probable that this new moon was sanctified as "Second Adar," *i.e.* the month was called the thirteenth of the preceding year, which thus became intercalary. Accordingly a second possible date is added in the table for 1 Nisan, viz. April 9-10, and in this case again it is practically certain that the new moon was sanctified by the evening of the ninth, since this was 52½ hours after conjunction. Moreover, it should be observed that even if for any cause the new moon was sanctified a day later, still the year would not be among those on which 1 Nisan could fall on Thursday or Friday. In the years 54, 57 and 60 but a single date is open, which by no reasonable supposition could fall on the fifth or sixth day of the week. In the year 59 1 Nisan may have been sanctified on

¹ See the Talmudic and other references in Schürer's *Excursus* above referred to, I. ii. p. 371 [Engl. Tr.]

the evening of April 2; more probably its sanctification went over until the evening of the third, but it is not reasonably supposable that it went over till the fourth. In the year 56 three dates are open, but by no possibility could any of them fall on the fifth or sixth days of the week, as according to Prof. Ramsay's exegesis they must ¹ in order that the day of Paul's departure from Troas should be a Monday. In the case of A.D. 55 and 58 alone could 1 Nisan have fallen on the fifth or sixth day of the week.

2. Relative probability has been indicated by suspended numerals, ¹ indicating the lowest and ³ the highest probability. Thus in A.D. 55 and 58 it is just possible that the new moon may have been observed early enough for the sanctification of 1 Nisan to have taken place on the date first given, but far more probably on the day following. But as the Passover would then fall in both years at an unusually early time there is an intermediate probability in favour of the date given third in order of time but marked ², as second in order of probability.

Perhaps the only thing that the table can be said to establish with entire certainty is the fact that the only two dates which Prof. Ramsay by his calculations finds admissible, one his own, viz. the year 56, the other that of the Eusebians, A.D. 54, together with Holtzmann's, A.D. 53, are just the three which the calendar argument in all its phases and possibilities is irreconcilably opposed to. If anything at all can be proved by this method, it is that we are shut up to a choice between the date 58 for Paul's arrest which the older chronographers, Wieseler and Lewin, had previously reckoned up by a curious counteraction of errors of calculation through errors of exegesis in coincidence with ourselves; and which is perhaps for that reason the year adopted by Schürer, Lightfoot, and the

¹ "Fourth or fifth" Prof. Ramsay would say; for he speaks of the 14 Nisan, whereas we reckon by 15 Nisan, the first day of Unleavened Bread.

dominant school of modern chronographers; or else the year 55, one year later than the Eusebian dating. As between the years 55 and 58 the preponderance of evidence in favour of the former by this method is so slight as not to enter into consideration. So far, then, as the exact year is concerned, the effect of the calendar argument on the Eusebian dating will be the same as that of the three synchronisms already discussed, viz. to bring it down one year later. So far as regards deciding between the Eusebian dating *as thus modified*, and the dating of Lightfoot, Schürer, Ewald and other recent authorities, it leaves the choice absolutely open.

BENJ. W. BACON.

*THE AMBROSIASTER AND ISAAC THE CON-
VERTED JEW.*

THE commentary on St. Paul's Epistles, which is usually cited as "the Ambrosiaster" because it has been ascribed to St. Ambrose, is praised by Bishop Lightfoot¹ as "one of the best Latin commentaries." Some account, therefore, of recent researches into the mystery of its authorship cannot fail to be interesting to English readers.

Once again it is Dom G. Morin, O.S.B., to whose critical insight we owe the discovery of the probable author of the *Te Deum*, who has patiently studied this thorny question until a clue has presented itself, which seems to satisfy all the conditions of the problem. He has stated his theory² modestly. He claims only to have introduced into the famous debate, for the first time, certain coincidences of language between the writings of the Ambrosiaster and two treatises of Isaac the converted Jew, who was a contemporary of Damasus. But the argument, by which he proves that to accept Isaac as the author of the former would at once make plain mysterious characteristics in the internal evidence, will, we are confident, appear convincing to most readers. The suggestion has been already accepted as a most happy discovery by Prof. Theodor Zahn,³ who is able to confirm it with an important quotation from St. Jerome.

Dom Morin assumes that the Ambrosiaster was also the author of the "Questions on the Old and New Testament," which have been wrongly attributed to St. Augustine. There is abundant internal evidence to prove this. The author was certainly a contemporary of Pope

¹ *Galatians*, Ed. 7, p. 232.

² *Revue d'histoire et de littérature relig.*, 1899, iv. No. 2.

³ *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, 7th July, 1899. I am indebted to both writers for copies of their articles.

Damasus, 366-384. (*Amb.*¹ 471 D: "ut cum totus mundus Dei sit, ecclesia tamen domus eius dicatur, cuius hodie rector est Damasus.") In Question xlv. 2243, it is stated that 300 years had passed since the destruction of Jerusalem; and in Question cxv. 2349, that the writer lived in Rome.

With these writings we have to compare: (i.) a short treatise by one Isaac on the Trinity and the Incarnation; (ii.) an exposition of the faith, which may be traced to the same pen.

i. The only old MS. of the treatise on the Trinity which has survived (Paris, B.N. *lat.* 1564 of the 9th century) contains the title, INCIPIT FIDES ISATIS EX IUDAE0. The first editor, Sirmond, with great probability identified this Isaac with the converted Jew of that name who calumniated Damasus.

ii. The exposition of faith, published by Caspari² from a MS. at Milan, from Bobbio (*Cod. Ambrosian.* I. 101 *sup. saec.* viii., which contains also the Muratorian Fragment), is only a fragment; but it has many points of resemblance to the treatise on the Trinity, and may have been derived from a common source.

Both of these writings have close resemblances in phraseology to the writings of the Ambrosiaster. In fact, the number is surprising when it is remembered that, taken together, they would not fill three pages of Migne's *Patrology*. Dom Morin singles out such phrases as *hoc genere, nascibilitas, solitarius, ratio non admittit, non cadere in, mysterium Trinitatis, ac per hoc*. He has found this last phrase 121 times in the Commentary, and 65 times in the Questions.

Not less striking are the resemblances in teaching. Both Isaac and the Ambrosiaster teach that it is wrong

¹ *Amb.* = Migne, *Patr. Lat.* 17, 45-508. *Qu.* = *ib.* 35, 2213-2416.

² *Kirchenhistorische Anekdota*, pp. 304-308,

to use adverbs of time, place, or manner, with reference to the Son of God,—that the resurrection is given as an example.

Isaac teaches that man, and man only among God's creatures, has been made in His image. The Ambrosiaster explains that the woman was not created in the image of God, and the same thought recurs in the Questions. Such eccentric theology excited much indignation, the echo of which was heard 150 years later, when another pope, writing to Cæsarius of Arles, took occasion to condemn such views.

The formula, *tres unum sunt*, which became popular in sermons on the Creed, is applied to the Trinity by Isaac, and in Question lxxxvii. 2280 f. The Procession of the Holy Spirit is expressed in similar terms in the Exposition, the Commentary, and the Questions. He is said to proceed from the Father, and to receive from the Son.

Having proved the possibility that these writings had a common authorship, it remains to state what is known of the Jew Isaac, and the conclusions to which the internal evidence of the writings of the Ambrosiaster seem to point.

It is known that a converted Jew, Isaac by name, played a prominent part in the troubles which arose after the election of Pope Damasus. When Ursinus, the chief of the schismatic party, had been exiled to Cologne, Isaac was charged with the task of stirring up accusations against Damasus. He succeeded in bringing a capital charge against him in the Court of the Prefect. The Emperor Gratian intervened, and saved Damasus from great danger. A synod of 43 bishops was held, before which the accusers were unable to substantiate their charges. It appears that two deacons, Concordius and Callistus, were put forward as complainants, though Isaac was the moving spirit. Isaac was then banished to Spain, under penalty of death

if he should raise any further disturbance. The *Records of the Synod* of 378 refer to his denial of the faith and return to Judaism; *qui facto ad synagogam recursu cœlestia mysterio profanavit.*

Prof. Zahn suggests that there is a reference to him in the following comment of St. Jerome¹ on Titus iii. 9: "Audi vi ego quendam de Hebraeis, qui se Romae in Christum credidisse simulabat, de genealogiis domini nostri Jesu Christi, quae scripta sunt in Matthaeo et Luca, facere quaestionem, quod videlicet a Salomone usque ad Joseph nec numero sibi nec vocabulorum aequalitate consentiant. Qui quum corda simplicium pervertisset, quasi ex adytis et oraculo defererebat quasdam, ut sibi videbatur, solutiones, quum magis debuerit justitiam et misericordiam et dilectionem dei quaerere et post illa, si forte occurrisset, de nominibus et numeris disputare."

These words simply imply that St. Jerome had heard a Jewish Christian lecture in Rome, who had thrown off the mask of an hypocritical Christianity since he left Rome. Such apostasy was rare, and the mention of Rome leads at once to the identification of the anonymous teacher with the Jew Isaac. As an apostate he was regarded as *dead*,² and is therefore not named, but the stress laid on justice, mercy, and the love of God, in opposition to the Jew's proud disputing and unjust accusations, seems to contain a reference to the merciless injustice of the accusers of Damasus.

This argument is confirmed by the fact that the name Isaac was very rare in the West. Prof. Zahn³ has looked for it in vain in the inscriptions relating to Roman Jews.

It remains to prove from the internal evidence that the Ambrosiaster held a position similar to that of the apostate Isaac.

¹ Ed. Vallarsi, vii. 735.

² Cf. *Ignat. Smyrn.* 5, *Philad.* 6.

³ p. 316 *Berliner Gesch. d. Jud. in Rom*, i. 55.

He complained (*Amb.* 475 D, 476 A) that the custom of the Synagogue to do nothing without the advice of the elders, which had been transmitted to the Church, was no longer observed. He attributed this to the indolence of teachers, or their pride in wishing to be alone in their importance. Prof. Zahn¹ makes use of this argument to prove that he could not have been a priest. The Bible of the Ambrosiaster and the Vulgate distinguishes between *seniores*, the honoured old men, and *presbyteri*, the priests. The author suggests that the *seniores* have been deprived of the influence due to their experience through the pride of the official teachers (*doctores* = bishops and priests). Lange,² who identified the Ambrosiaster with the priest Faustinus, founded his argument on a passage in Question cxx., which is plainly part of a sermon preached at the beginning of Lent. It is very doubtful, however, whether priests had the right to preach at all in Rome during the 4th and 5th centuries. Dom Morin notes the way in which the writer speaks of "Our priests" (*Amb.* 466; *Qu.* cix. 2325), which makes it almost certain that he was a layman. Nor is it strange that a layman should take so much interest in doctrinal questions. Tychonius the Donatist, and in Rome Victorinus, the celebrated professor of rhetoric, were as eager theological disputants during that period as some laymen of our own time. As to the homily, it is quite possible that it was written for some one else. Thus St. Jerome was invited to write an Easter sermon, *Praeconium Paschale*, for a deacon Praesidius.³

The Ambrosiaster complained further that the Jewish custom of appointing masters to teach children to read had fallen into disuse. He grumbled at the way in which relief was dispensed to widows, asserting that some recipients were of bad character, and that some had husbands still

¹ p. 317. ² *Gesch. der Römischen Kirche*, Bonn, 1881, p. 600 f.

³ Morin, p. 24.

living. He traced the abuse to the negligence or culpable complicity of influential persons.

He criticised the Canon of the Mass in which Melchizedek was called "High Priest of the Most High," affirming that Christ only had a right to the title.

He brought many charges against the Roman clergy, blaming their boastfulness, *iactantiam Romanorum levitarum*, and reviewed somewhat complaisantly the ambition and worldliness of Church dignitaries, accusing them of homicide, immorality, and all sorts of crimes (*Amb.* 482 C). These were precisely the charges which were made by the accusers of Damasus. And it is noteworthy that, though he condemns light gathering of accusations against those in high place as Vicars of Christ, yet he allows murmuring against them in a just cause, and urges that there must be no hesitation in denouncing them when their blameworthiness is beyond doubt.

His intimate acquaintance with all things connected with Judaism, which has been suggested in the foregoing description of his interests, may be illustrated again and again. His opinions on Church affairs were often coloured by Jewish feeling. He showed knowledge of Jewish legends and apocryphal books. He made out that St. Paul in 1 Corinthians ii. 9 quoted the apocryphal Apocalypse of Elias, and saw in 2 Timothy iii. 8 a reference to the apocryphal books of Jannes and Mambres. On 1 Corinthians xiv. 31, he mentioned a tradition of the Synagogue which the Apostle would have us observe. In religious discussions all should be seated, the most honoured on chairs, the next on benches, the rest on mats spread on the floor.

Another interesting personal trait is the profound respect which he exhibits for Roman law, and the considerable knowledge which he shows as a jurist. He quotes by memory a constitution of Diocletian against the Manicheans, which is only known through one small collection of the end of

the 4th century. He mentions a law which forbade the practice of astrology in Rome, and the ancient Roman custom which forbade women to drink wine.¹ With reference to Novatian he recalls the principle that it is not possible to be judge and accuser in the same case.

From this evidence of a cold and critical spirit, of full acquaintance with Judaism, and of legal interests, it may surely be argued with some confidence that the unknown Ambrosiaster was the converted Jew Isaac. After his shameless apostasy his writings were circulated anonymously or under false names. Within twenty years an anonymous work, which can be identified with great probability as Question cix. (on Melchizedek) was sent to St. Jerome by a priest called Evangelus. St. Jerome answered in an aggrieved tone that he did not know whether it was his correspondent or the writer, who was unwilling to acknowledge the authorship in the desire to avoid criticism. St. Augustine² ascribed these writings to St. Hilary of Poitiers. Some writers have therefore concluded that they were written by some other Hilary. But it is more probable, as Prof. Zahn³ suggests, that the Roman booksellers sold them in Africa under a false name. In former times they used to send books which did not sell in Rome to Utica or Ilerda (*Hor. Epist.* 1, 20, 13) Zahn quotes the complaints of an African Christian of the 4th century about their avarice. During the middle ages it was usually the name of St. Ambrose which was attached to these writings, and supplied the derivation of the familiar name "the Ambrosiaster."

In conclusion we may echo Prof. Zahn's wish that some

¹ Another sidelight on the social history is given by a reference to the autopsy made on the bodies of criminals.

² *c. duas epp. Pelagianorum*, iv. 4.

³ p. 314.

⁴ *Can. Mommsen. a. E.*

one would write a large book on the materials so concisely described by Dom Morin, and ratify his convincing argument. It should prove a very interesting subject.

A. E. BURN.

APOCALYPTIC SKETCHES.

X.

THE GREAT WHITE THRONE.

REV. XX.

IN the preceding chapter we had the overthrow first of the woman, with the coming forth of the pure bride of God; next of the beast and the false prophet, his ally, before the conquering Bridegroom. In this chapter we have the overthrow of the dragon, "that old serpent the devil," followed by the appearance in heaven of "the great white throne," before which are gathered all nations for the final award of weal or woe.

We have then before us two great subjects: (1) the overthrow of Satan; (2) the general judgment. It so happens, however, that in setting forth the former of these there comes in a reference to an interval of 1,000 years, during which Satan is represented, not as yet destroyed, but bound, and cast into the abyss, after which he is to break forth again with new energy and rage, only to share at last the fate of the beast and the false prophet, which had been cast into the lake of fire.

This millennium comes in only as an episode, and scarcely even that, for it is treated merely as an incident in the victory over Satan; and there is no other reference to this precise period in any other part of the book, nor indeed in any other part of the Bible. Yet, strange to say, this exceedingly obscure and difficult passage in a corner

of an exceedingly difficult book has been lifted into an altogether fictitious importance by the libraries of controversy which have been produced on the subject. One of the wise sayings of the Apostle to the Gentiles is this: "Let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith." Surely that needful caution has been sadly overlooked in the extraordinary proportions to which this age-long discussion of the millennium has been extended. Of all the difficult passages in the Book of Revelation the verses in the 20th chapter referring to this period of 1,000 years are the most difficult. Surely then one would expect great modesty and moderation in any attempts that may be made to interpret it. And yet what an amount of confident dogmatism does one find in looking over the long history of the weary controversy. It has not infrequently happened that readers of the Book of Revelation have begun by making up their minds irrevocably about the millennium, and then have proceeded to force the rest of the book, and any of the rest of the Bible that could be so forced, into agreement with their preconceived views. Think, for example, how many passages in the prophets of the Old Testament, in which there is no reference whatever to a period of 1,000 years, have been taken out of their connection, and fitted into their supposed place in this 20th chapter of Revelation; and passages in the Epistles have been treated in much the same way; and great schemes have been drawn up in which a whole programme of the future has been made out in detail, sometimes with exact dates. Happily there is a greater spirit of modesty now abroad, and a greater disposition to acknowledge the difficulties which every intelligent reader must feel in attempting any detailed exposition of this difficult passage.

There is one portion of Old Testament prophecy with which this passage is most closely connected, viz. the

38th and 39th chapters of Ezekiel, which deal with the great final uprising of the nations under Gog from the land of Magog against the city of God, "the beloved city" as John calls it here. We have already had evidence that this prophecy is in the seer's mind, for any one can see that the carrion feast of the vultures in the 19th chapter is a wonderfully close parallel with a banquet of the same kind described in Ezekiel xxxix. 17-24; and that this prophecy still remains in his mind throughout the vision of Satan's overthrow is evident from the fact that at the close of it (*vv.* 8, 9) the names of Gog and Magog are used as the earthly leaders of the hostile armies, and the brief account of the war is evidently based on the larger one given by the ancient prophet.

We have found throughout that the seer of Patmos makes continual and free use of the imagery of the Old Testament prophets, not in the way of quotation or repetition, but as furnishing a set of symbols familiar to his readers as well as to himself, and therefore ready to his hand to construct a record of the visions and revelations which were granted to him. It is therefore necessary to distinguish between that which belongs to the mere phrasing and that which is of the essence of the revelation. The phrasing is old, the revelation is new, and we must beware of mistaking the old phraseology for fresh revealings. We have seen, for example, that the name Armageddon, or the mountain of Megiddo, in the 16th chapter, was used, not to mark out the exact spot where a great battle was to be fought in the future, but to call up to the mind of the readers of the book the great historic battles which had made the name famous, in order to impress the imagination with the greatness of the conflict, very much as we might say that there was prospect of another Waterloo, without meaning that on that very spot there would be an exact repetition of the old contest.

Here, then, the question comes as to the period of 1,000 years. What association had it for a Hebrew mind? There is, as we have seen, no passage in the Bible which answers this question; even in the Gog and Magog passage, which is specially in his mind, there is no mention of date or period; but it was a familiar rabbinical tradition that the days of the Messiah were to be 1,000 years. As there was no scriptural authority for this, it seems evident that the number was used, according to the common Hebrew custom, in a mystical sense; and accordingly it would lie ready to the hand of the mystic in Patmos. The principal mystical numbers of the Apocalypse are 3, 7, 10, with their parts and multiples. So we have again and again the three years and a half, which stood, not for that exact space of time, but for a broken 7. And just as 666 seemed in its symbolical meaning to be equivalent to wanting, wanting, wanting—three sixes, each one of them just falling short of the complete 7, so may not 1,000 be equal to $10 \times 10 \times 10$, in order to give threefold force to the largest of the mystical numbers of the Apocalypse?

The only periods of time mentioned so far in the book have been comparatively short stretches, the $3\frac{1}{2}$ years, or its equivalent, 42 months or 1,260 days, being the longest. I am quite aware that there are interpreters who take a day for a year, and so stretch out the 1,260 days to 1,260 years; but there is no authority for this. It was done once in one of the acted prophecies of Ezekiel; but there is no authority for applying this to prophecy in general, the very fact that in that particular case it is specified being an indication that where not specified it does not apply. And if it be applied here so as to make $3\frac{1}{2}$ years = 1,260 years, then we should have to deal, in this 20th chapter, not with 1,000 years, but 360,000 years. The longest period, then, which has been specified so far has been $3\frac{1}{2}$

years. The visions, as distinctly announced at the beginning, have had to do in substance with that which will shortly come to pass ; but here the prophet is conscious of a sudden enlargement of the scope of his view : he sees a tract of time stretching out before him without any clear limit, and he very naturally, in order to describe it, makes use of the mystic number 1,000, which was conventionally applied to the years of the Messiah. This conventional association of 1,000 years with the times of the Messiah was no doubt the main reason why there was such terrible excitement at the close of the first millennium of the Christian era. There was a general expectation among Christian people that the world was coming to an end. And now we are running on towards the last century of the second millennium, and still the times of the Messiah are in progress. But all difficulty on this head disappears when we bear in mind that the number is not used in a definite numerical sense, but in the mystical sense in which we continually find numbers used in the Apocalypse. We found that there were more than seven Churches in Asia, but the number 7 is used because it is the number of perfection. Why then should there be any more difficulty in discovering that the great Armageddon, or Gog and Magog uprising of the nations, is postponed for more than a thousand years? The figure seems, in fact, to be used with something of the same indefiniteness as we now use the word *myriad*. A *myriad*, properly speaking, is 10,000 ; but we continually talk of *myriads* without the slightest intention of laying stress on that particular number.

Leaving, then, questions of date, which seem from what we have discovered to be quite indeterminate, what are the main ideas intended to be conveyed in connection with this period indicated by the mystic number? The answer turns on the meaning we attach to the first and the second resurrections. Here we cannot but recall the great passage in

our author's Gospel, where two resurrections are spoken of in succession (John v. 25-29). That is the only other passage in the Bible where two resurrections are successively spoken of; and as it occurs in a book by the same author, we ought to have here, if anywhere, the key to our interpretation. There clearly the first is the spiritual resurrection of those who have passed from death unto life by faith in Christ (v. 25); the second is the resurrection of the body, when "all that are in the tombs shall hear His voice and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done ill unto the resurrection of judgment" (vv. 28, 29, R.V.). Now does not the passage before us look like an expansion of this teaching of the Lord put in the poetic language of the imagination?

That the first resurrection is spiritual and not physical seems implied in the use of the word "souls": "I saw the souls of the martyrs and the saints living and reigning with Christ." Those who are risen with Christ reign with Him. So far as they are concerned Satan is bound and cast into the abyss. This is an idea which runs all through John's great Epistle. "Whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not." "To this end was the Son of God manifested that He might destroy the works of the devil." "We know that whosoever is begotten of God sinneth not; but He that was begotten of God keepeth him, and the evil one toucheth him not." So here: "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection." True, the victory is not yet complete, but Satan is bound. The wicked one toucheth him not.¹ And though there is to be a great assembling of

¹ It may be said that such expressions are too strong as applied to ordinary Christian experience in the days of the Messiah. But remember again what we have so often had occasion to observe, that this apostle continually deals with ideal contrasts. The description is not in any more exalted terms than the description of the sun-clad woman, or of the seven golden candlesticks. It is the ideal he is always giving us. And if you look at the description of the

the forces of evil before the final triumph over the great enemy, like that gathering of Gog and the princes of the land of Magog in the prophecy of Ezekiel, there is no cause for alarm, for, as foretold by the Old Testament seer, fire shall come from heaven and devour the armies of the aliens; and now, at last, the dragon shall be finally discomfited, being cast into the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone. And after that comes the second resurrection: "I saw the dead" (not "souls" this time, but the dead, all the dead, those buried in the sea as well as in the land), "the great and the small, standing before the throne."

I am perfectly aware that this is not a complete exposition, nor is it free from difficulty; but it has this great recommendation, that it is in full consistency with other parts of Scripture. It is the result of an honest and earnest attempt to deal with the passage on the principle the apostle lays down, "according to the proportion of faith"; and it certainly keeps prominently before the mind that which it is the main object of the whole passage to teach, that even that old serpent the devil, before his final overthrow, can be bound and rendered powerless so far as those are concerned who are truly risen with Christ and sit with Him in heavenly places, and will certainly in the end be overwhelmed with destruction no less complete than that which has overtaken his allies on the earth.

Now that we have dealt with the first of our two great subjects, the preliminary binding and final overthrow of Satan, we are prepared for looking at the second—the general judgment (*vv.* 11–15). It is a much simpler pas-

saints living and reigning with Christ during the thousand years, that is, during all the years of the Messiah's reign on earth, including the present time, you will find that it is no stronger than the expressions already quoted from the Epistle of John, and no stronger than the corresponding representations in the Epistles of Paul, where he speaks of Christians as "risen with Christ and sitting with Him in heavenly places."

sage than the other, and full of solemnity. May it be with reverence and holy awe that we approach so great and terrible a subject.

The first resurrection was that of the blessed and holy, the resurrection from the death of sin to the life of faith. The second is the resurrection of all the dead, small and great, the resurrection in which all have part except those who are alive and remain till the coming of the Lord. For you will observe it is not souls only, but bodies also, that are now concerned. "And the sea gave up the dead which were in it" (there can be no mistake that this is the resurrection of the body); "and Death and Hades gave up the dead which were in them," Death giving up the bodies, Hades the souls. Clearly it is the general and final resurrection: "I saw the dead great and small stand before the throne," the great white throne. Yes, it is the final judgment, the last assize. "I saw a great white throne, and Him that sat upon it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away." "Behold, the heavens are not pure in His sight, and He chargeth His angels with folly." How then shall earth appear before Him? "And there was no place for them." "Who shall stand when He appeareth?"

"And books were opened"—we are not told how many; but is it not most natural to suppose that for each soul there is a book? And yet not for all souls; for over against the many books there is one book sharply distinguished from the many books, and called "the Book of Life," in which many names are written. Why the sharp distinction? Have we not the key in that passage already referred to in the Gospel, where before the first resurrection is spoken of there is this significant declaration, "He that heareth My word, and believeth Him that sent Me, hath eternal life, *and cometh not into judgment*, but hath passed out of death into life." Those whose names are written in the Book of Life have been judged already; and perhaps

that is what is meant by the statement about them in the 4th verse: "I saw thrones, and they sat on them (*i.e.*, those living and reigning with Christ), and judgment was given unto them." They have been judged already. Their sins are all forgiven, blotted out of remembrance; the books recording them have been destroyed; their names are already written in the Lamb's Book of Life. There needs only one book for them all; for though they too differ endlessly from each other, they are all alike in this, that they have "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." The Book of Life is one book. But the books of judgment are many; and all who have rejected the forgiveness offered them through Christ and the gift of eternal life which He bestows, will be judged according to the books, each according to his own book, or, as it is here put, "every man according to their works." The judgment will be a righteous judgment; all allowance will be made; nothing will be charged against a man but what he is clearly and fully responsible for; but though all this is true, who is there that would choose to demand his own book and refuse to accept the atonement by which all sin is blotted out and the name written in the Lamb's Book of Life? It is not said here that every one who is judged by his own book shall be condemned; but it is said that all whose names "were not found written in the Book of Life were cast into the lake of fire." Does that mean that those are all lost who never heard of Christ? Certainly not. "The Lord knoweth them that are His," whether they all know Him or not, wherever their lot is cast. And many names will be found in the Book of Life which God only knows. There will be many surprises in that day. There will be names in the Book of Life which scarce any one expected to see there; and there will be names not found in the Book of Life which almost every one expected to see. The

only names which we can venture to say will certainly not be there will be the names of those who have deliberately rejected the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.

And now the enemies are all vanquished and the great salvation is complete. The Scarlet Woman has perished; the beast is no more; the false prophet deceives no longer; Satan is not bound merely, but cast with his allies into the lake of fire. And now the last enemy, Death, is destroyed: death himself with his shadow, Hades: "Death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire." Christ has had the keys of both. Remember the great words at the opening of this marvellous Apocalypse: "Fear not; I am the First, and the Last, and the Living one; and I was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore; and I have the keys of death and of Hades." He has kept them all the while. He has given His beloved sleep, He has watched their very dust; but now the keys have served their purpose, and may follow death and Hades into the burning lake. His people are all free from both; "and death and Hades are cast into the lake of fire." Now it is "life for evermore," life free from sin and pain and death; a new life, with a new environment too, as we shall see in the two magnificent chapters which still lie before us ere we close.

J. MONRO GIBSON.

TO WHAT TRIBE DID SAMUEL BELONG?

THE genealogy given at the beginning of the Book runs thus: Zuph, Tohu, Elihu, Jeroham, Elkanah, Samuel. The sons of Samuel were Joel his firstborn, and Abiah his second (1 Sam. 8. 2).

So far there is no Tribal reference. Strange to say, of the two Hebrew words translated "Tribe," one (בִּטָּה) is never used in the Book in this sense, and the other (שִׁבְט) is only used generally of the Tribes of Israel, and, in two passages, of the Tribe of Benjamin. Under these circumstances it is not perhaps so astonishing that Samuel's Tribe should not be distinctly named.

The fact that Elkanah is called a man of Mount Ephraim and that his ancestor Zuph is called an Ephrathite (R.V. Ephraimite) has led some students to regard him as a member of the Tribe of Ephraim. But a man might be an Ephraimite by residence and yet belong to another Tribe. Thus Sheba, who is called a man of Mount Ephraim in 2 Samuel 20. 21, is described as a Benjamite in the first verse. So also the Kohathites, who had their lot out of the Tribe of Ephraim, Dan and Manasseh (Josh. 21. 20-25), would naturally be described according to their residence as Ephraimite, etc. We read in Judges 19. 1 of a Levite sojourning in Mount Ephraim, and in chapter 17. 7 we come across a young man out of Bethlehem Judah of the family of Judah who was a Levite, but sojourned there.

So far we see that Samuel may have been of the Tribe of Ephraim, or of the Tribe of Levi and of Kohath's family, which was partly resident in Mount Ephraim; or he might possibly belong to some other Tribe. But we must look further afield to make sure of our ground.

On turning to 1 Chronicles 6. we find two Kohathite genealogies which bear on our subject, and which are

placed immediately after the Aaronite pedigree. One of them traces a line down from Levi's son Kohath to Samuel's children (*vv.* 22-28), and the other traces up from Heman (Samuel's grandson) to Jacob. This is not a solitary instance of a duplicate genealogy, for we have two in the case of Saul (*chap.* 8. 29-38, and 9. 35-44); and we are familiar with the two genealogies in the New Testament, one coming down from Abraham to Joseph, and the other going up from Joseph to Adam. In these and similar cases there is no attempt to give complete lists of families. The object is simply to show relationships, and to indicate lines of descent.

The three pedigrees of Samuel which we thus possess may be set forth in parallel columns as follows:

A.		B.		C.
1 CHRON. 6.		1 CHRON. 6.		EXOD. 6. 16, 24;
33-38.		22-28.		NUM. 16. 1.
Levi				Levi
Kohath		Kohath		Kohath
Izhar		Amminadab		Izhar
Korah		Korah		Korah
Ebiasaph	[Assir, Elkanah,]	Abiasaph		Assir, Elkanah, Abia- saph
Assir		Assir		
Tahath		Tahath		
Zephaniah		Uriel		
Azariah		Uzziah		
Joel		Shaul		
Elkanah	[and the sons of]	Elkanah		
Amasai		Amasai		
Mahath		Abimoth		
Elkanah		Elkanah		1 SAM. 1. 1.
Zuph	[the sons of]	Zophai		Zuph
Toah		Nahath		Tohu
Eliel		Eliab		Elihu
Jeroham		Jeroham		Jeroham
Elkanah		Elkanah		Elkanah
Samuel	[and the sons of]	Samuel		Samuel
Joel	[the firstborn]	. . . and the second Abiah		The firstborn Joel and the second Abiah
Heman				

Most of the variations in these lists are familiar to those who have studied other Hebrew genealogies. Thus, such changes in spelling as Zuph and Zophai, Ahimoth and Mahath, Joel and Shaul, Samuel and Shemuel, are easily accounted for. The last-named, indeed, is simply a freak of the translators. The substitution of Amminadab for Izhar is more puzzling. It may have been a case of adoption. The names Azariah and Uziah have practically the same meanings, and we have a similar variation in the case of the well-known king of Judah. Zephaniah and Uriel are almost opposite in sense; the one marks the Divine hiding, the other the God-sent light. Eliel and Eliab are obviously related (cf. 1 Chron. 27. 18, where Elihu seems to stand for Eliab); so are Nahath and Toah (תורה and נחית). The omission of the name of Samuel's firstborn (Joel) may have been a copyist's error, but our translators are mainly answerable for turning Vashni (*i.e.* "and the second") into a proper name.

It should be added that several of the names reappear in connection with the Korhite or Kohathite family in other connections. Thus there was a Korhite Elkanah in David's band (1 Chron. 12. 8); and a Kohathite Uriel among those who brought up the ark to Jerusalem, and he had 120 kinsmen. Also in the age of Hezekiah we find among the Kohathites Mahath the son of Amasai, and Joel the son of Azariah (2 Chron. 29. 14).

A comparison of the lists as a whole seems to prove that in spite of all their variations and corruptions we have *bona-fide* family records; and these records testify to the fact that Samuel was a descendant of the ill-fated Korah, of whose sons we are told in a note (Num. 26. 9) that they did not perish with their father. Samuel was thus a Ephraimite or Ephraimite by residence, and a Kohathite by blood.

Turning back to the Pentateuch, we find that the Kohathite

thites had important duties during the early history of the people. They had charge of the ark and the vessels of the sanctuary, and had to bear them on their shoulders whenever the camp moved on. Special provision was made for their security when approaching the sacred things (Num. 4. 18 ff.). In and after the time of David the Kohathites were among the most notable of the Temple officials, being in charge of the musical department, and having to prepare the shewbread and other bakemeats (*see* 1 Chron. 9. 31, 32, which perhaps refers to the time of Nehemiah). Probably their representatives had to do with the Temple services in our Lord's time.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

DID THE ASSYRIANS COIN MONEY?

FROM time to time not a few questions have received positive reply rather from the absence of knowledge than from exact information or legitimate reasoning. A century ago such definite assertion on questions of Biblical archæology was regarded as legitimate, and each assertion, made by men reputed to be learned, was an addition to the accumulating mass of authority on the point. It seems to have occurred to few to suspect that in the matter of learning there was little to choose between the authorities, for there was next to nothing for any one to learn. So the latest assertion on either side added no real weight to the first that was uttered.

The recovery of a long-lost language and a whole literature must needs set men revising opinions previously expressible with the most comfortable certainty. Hence it is to be expected that even the opinions of the learned on matters concerned with Assyrian or Babylonian antiquities will now be called in question. Further still, we have now in our possession, not only books and the longer sort of documents in a fairly well understood language, from which we may gather up hints; but a vast number of business memoranda, private contracts, commercial lists, receipts, and other purely personal and individual matters, noted with all the circumstantial accuracy of men to whom the shekel was an object of deep concern.

Did the Assyrians possess coined money? The answer hitherto given has been a decided negative. Ancient historians (Herodotus, I. 94, for example) are positive that the Lydians were the first to use coins. The reiteration of that statement by innumerable scholars adds no weight to it, unless they have independent information on the point. It may, however, be doubted whether the Father of History meant to deny coins to the Assyrians. A calculated

and systematized currency, with a clear understanding of its commercial powers and advantages, may rather be the achievement which he ascribes to Lydia. Taking the statement in the baldest sense much will depend on what is the correct theoretical definition of a coin. It is certain the Assyrians came very near to using coins. It is, of course, possible they never took the final step. An interesting parallel to this may be found from their own history. The later documents show the syllabic signs becoming more and more indifferent to the quality of their included vowels. At the same time the actual alphabetic, or rather monosyllabic, signs, usually called Aramaic letters, were perfectly familiar to them. The two systems of writing occur side by side on the same tablet. Yet Nineveh fell before its inhabitants had an alphabet of their own.

At one period a not too exacting observer might have returned to Greece with the assertion that Assyria had an alphabet; and the more careful he was to inquire into the matter, the more arguments he could find for his assertion. Yet it would not have been strictly true. So a very accurate observer, with a high standard of what currency should be, might deny the existence of coinage, while admitting the great advances made in its direction. To one who was not a trained political economist, the advantages of the Lydian system might easily seem so great that any previous attempts would be regarded with an unfair contempt. Admiration for the new method would be all the keener, while its novelty added a charm. To this we may fairly add the doubt how far Herodotus was actually acquainted with the domestic economy of Nineveh. Babylon survived, and information concerning Assyria was doubtless coloured by Babylonian prejudices. The effacement of Nineveh seems to have been one of the miracles of history. It may well be that Assyria had used potential coins without recognising the significance of coinage, and

the national disaster may have swept the remembrance of their achievement from men's minds.

Granting, however, for the sake of argument, that we are not entitled to demur to the statement that the Lydians were the first to use coins, we may object that it actually implies the use of coin in Assyria. Further, we may doubt whether it really denies the existence of what we should certainly admit to be coins. The Assyrian and Babylonian documents may also have something to say on the point that will seriously modify the sense in which we are to take the assertion.

Let us consider all that is implied in the Lydian use of coin. It is admitted that they adopted two standards—one to suit their eastern trade with Mesopotamia, the other for the western trade with the coast of Asia Minor. Their coins then admittedly reached the markets of Babylonia. There could be no other reason for adopting a double standard than the certainty that coins, acceptable in the Greek cities of Asia Minor, would be disapproved of in Mesopotamia. The date of this invention has been placed as early as the eighth century B.C. Nineveh was dominant till near the end of the seventh century. These Lydian coins could not have been current in Babylonia without being well known in Assyria also. Suppose, however, we bring down the date of the invention to a period subsequent to the fall of Nineveh. It becomes doubtful whether we can then maintain the Lydian claim to priority; for Pheidon coined silver at Ægina, and, as he was reigning before the end of the seventh century, Greek coinage must have existed soon after the fall of Nineveh (c. B.C. 607).

Hence, on any supposition, the Lydian claim to priority of coinage implies the presence of Lydian coins in Babylonian markets in the early part of the sixth century. It is safe to say that no unequivocal mention of coin occurs in the innumerable Babylonian contracts and business docu-

ments of that period. They only make mention of the long-known money denominations of shekel, mina, and talent. These terms they had used unchanged for fifteen centuries. The name *dariku*, which some have tried to connect with *daric*, came into use before the Persian supremacy. It is not certain that the *dariku* was a coin at all. Later, in the fifth century, the stater appears under the form *istatiranu*.

We are therefore compelled to conclude that at one time, though the Babylonians were using coins, they gave them no special name. The coins were purposely made of a size and weight to suit Babylonian standards. They were spoken of by the old names belonging to the ancient bullion weights that had preceded them as money. If the new money had been of distinct weight and value from the old shekels and minas, prices could not have been intelligibly stated without naming those coins.

This conclusion carries with it other consequences. If we admit that when coins first came into use the same names were applied to them as had been given to their uncoined equivalents, then no evidence of such introduction need be looked for in the statement of prices. If such an invention as coinage had been native, and taken place by gradual changes in the use of masses of metal, of definite size and shape, stamped with a denomination and some characteristic mark or device, then the evidence of these changes is even less likely to force itself upon us in the statement of prices. When a shekel ingot was first stamped with a mark of quality or value, it was still called a shekel. No one step in the process of evolution of coin from uncoined money calls for a new name. It is possible, however, that the device on a coin will at length win for it a new name. Thus coins stamped with the head of an ox will be called "oxen" in time. A shekel stamped with the head of an ox would, however, continue to be called a

shekel in statements of sums of money, where the addition of the amounts would involve the relation between the various denominations. If we could point to a document where so many "sheep" and "oxen" were added, and the result stated as so many "lions," we should be justified in assuming that these animals' names denoted coins, and that the coin stamped with the figure of a lion was a higher denomination than the "sheep" or "ox." If, however, the "sheep" or "ox" coin was admittedly only a coined shekel, the old sign would still be used to denote it. These signs are ideograms, like our £ s. d. The name for a "sovereign" might become a "George," in deference to its device; but we should not discard £ as its sign in our bills.

That this accurately expresses the state of affairs in Assyria is not easily proved. The Assyrians have left us no treatise on their currency, nor even a schoolboy's arithmetic. Yet alongside the almost invariable expression of sums of money by the old signs that had done duty when money was simple bullion, we have indications that the money had acquired names which are suggestive of coin devices. It seems impossible otherwise to explain the addition of the word *purimê*, literally "wild asses," to a sum of minas of bronze. Were these really living animals, part of the purchase money, or its accepted equivalent, the price must have been differently stated. Thus "twenty minas of bronze in lieu of x. *purimê*," or "twenty minas of bronze together with x. *purimê*," would permit us to imagine living animals, x. of which would be taken as equivalent to twenty minas of bronze, or as part of the price. Such equivalent alternatives and compound prices do occur stated in this manner. On the other hand, "twenty minas of bronze *purimê*" can only mean that *purimê* was a name for a mina of bronze. The absence of a numeral before *purimê* is decisive. Either as an alterna-

tive price, or as an addition to it, the number of wild asses could not have been left vague and undetermined. I purposely leave out of question here the nature of the animal and its possible Lydian origin, because I shall discuss it technically elsewhere. An early Lydian coin device is a running animal said to be "a fox"; early Greek coins also show "a hare." The Assyrian ideogram merely demands "an animal of the plain." The argument is untouched by these details. It is highly improbable that a mina of bronze could bear an animal name, save from a coin device. If this is admitted, the Assyrians used coins. It is not proved that these were of native mints. This example does not stand alone. There is some evidence, less conclusive but plausible, that another coin bore the device of a "sheep."

As a rule, however, to the latest hour of their independent existence, the Assyrians used, in the statement of prices, the old signs for shekel, mina and talent, which equally well expressed the weights of bullion in those moneys. We know how rudimentary the early Lydian coins were. If, on their introduction to Assyrian markets, they marked but a small advance on the money already in use and made no change in value, they called for no distinctive name. It was quite otherwise with a foreign money like the mina of Carchemish, whose weight was about half that of the native Assyrian mina. No statement of price could be accurate which intended Carchemish minas without naming them. Even then the name mina persists. That no new name was given does not prove the absence of a coin device, but merely that the Carchemish mina became known to Assyrian traders before it bore any such device. The adoption of a coin device would not at once lead to a new name. In the statement of prices a device name would take long to appear. The old reckonings and signs would persistently remain.

The arguments hitherto used reach further still. If we cannot expect to find documentary evidence of coined money even when it was certainly in use, no valid argument can be built on the absence of terms, unequivocally denoting coined money, from the Assyrian documents. It is certain that Gyges, king of Lydia, entered into friendly relations with Assyria before the end of the seventh century. If this did not introduce a foreign coinage into Assyria, there is not yet any proof that Assyria did not already use coins. The borrowing may be on the Lydian side. Nothing compelled the Assyrian scribes to advertise the fact that they used coins, unless coinage had altered the weights of the shekel, mina or talent in use before.

The Assyrians certainly used separate pieces of metal of uniform weight, if not of uniform size, as money. For it is the usage of the scribes not to employ the sign of the plural after the signs for weights and measures, unless the amount is to be considered as consisting of separate pieces ; just as we distinguish between our use of the words " pence " and " pennies." Now all through the Assyrian documents we find sums expressed as so many shekels, without the plural sign when regard is had to the amount merely ; but also very often with the plural sign, involving the existence of separate shekel pieces. That goes a long way to show that separate shekel pieces were used, and that the silver was not merely weighed out as bullion. It shows that shekel pieces were counted, though it does not show they were coined. It is, however, quite consistent with their being coined. On the other hand, the very conspicuous absence of a plural sign after the signs for minas of silver makes it probable that no such large piece of silver as the mina was separately used. Numbers of shekels may have made up each mina ; or ingots of various weights may still have been used for larger sums of silver. The plural sign is, however, quite usual after minas of bronze. These may

have already become coins of a sort ; at any rate, separate bronze mina pieces are fairly certain.

Whatever difference is really marked by the employment of the plural sign after the signs for money values concerns the shekel of silver and the mina of bronze alone. It is not fair, however, to insist that separate silver mina pieces were not in use. If they actually were as much in use as separate silver shekels, the use of the plural sign for the shekels only may imply more than their mere separateness ; it may silently serve to mark the fact that they were already coins. In what sense could they be coins ? Separate ingots or blocks of metal, stamped with their value or weight, we may hesitate to call coins. Probably Herodotus would not recognise such as coins. On the other hand, Assyrian scribes, having been accustomed to such money, would probably not regard the introduction of more distinctly coin-shaped money as a change calling for a fresh nomenclature. Values would not be changed ; they were not writing about coins, whether they used them or not, only recording prices. Even were coins in use and distinctly named colloquially, prices would be stated in the old terms. When centuries later coins of a different value and name came into use, they were duly named.

It now seems appropriate to examine the evidence for the shape of the money pieces. We know that the precious metals were cast into ingots, and have some idea of their shape. We read of *libnâti*, literally "bricks" of gold ; the shape of these ingots admits of no doubt. We read of *lišânê*, literally "tongues." Never do we read of these ingots being used as money. We may argue, with some show of reason, that at any rate the money pieces were not of these shapes. Even if they were, it only needed the impress of a stamp to make them rudimentary coins ; if they were circular or oval cakes of metal so stamped, what more do we want ?

The use of stamps for impressing an inscription on a brick had been known for centuries. Incised inscriptions on weights are in our museums. The use of seal impressions on documents proves the possession of the artistic skill necessary to produce the device for a coin. The seals were usually stone, but their impression in clay would serve for a mould. Such clay moulds are known to have been used for later coinage in Greece. The Assyrians, however, also cut inscriptions on metal. The early Lydian coins were clearly impressed by a stamp. Further, the connection between coin and seal devices is very close. The designs on the early Persian coins are very like the royal seal device used for some century or more by the Assyrian kings. Is it too much to suppose that when the Persians conquered Assyria that very royal seal fell into their hands and was used by them as the heirs of the old rulers? If so, and their coin device was copied from it, what is to prevent our believing that the same use had been made before by Assyria?

We know that Lydia coined money before the fall of Nineveh or soon after. If the intercourse between the nations was too slight to admit of a rapid spread of the invention, we may turn in another direction and note the probable state of affairs there. The land of the Hittites certainly possessed all the means necessary for the production of coins. The so-called "boss" of Tarkondemos bears an incuse inscription in both Hittite and cuneiform characters as well as a royal figure. If it had weighed an exact number of shekels, or had borne a number indicating its value, we must have admitted it to be a coin. Of course its date precedes the fall of the Hittite empire. Now Car-chemish, itself a Hittite capital, played a very important part in Assyrian commerce. This city lost its political independence in B.C. 717, and became absorbed in the Assyrian Empire. Yet its standard shekel and mina continued in use

to the end of the seventh century. Had those shekels and minas been mere bullion, it is passing strange they should not have been reweighed, as such, in Assyrian scales. If, as seems certain, the Carchemish mina weighed just half an ordinary Assyrian one, it would surely have passed in Assyria as a half-mina; or, if not exactly that, would have been treated in bulk as bullion. The only thing that was likely to prevent this treatment would be some distinguishing mark declaring it to be a mina. If then the Carchemish money was stamped with its value, we are very near to coins.

A little further consideration will make it still more likely that the Carchemish money was a rudimentary coin. In the Assyrian deeds and documents of the seventh century B.C., Carchemish minas are continually named. If these transactions had been between Assyrian traders on the one side and Carchemish merchants on the other, one could understand it, but between Assyrians it seems hard to understand why they should use Carchemish minas when they had their own. Even where foreign coins are used largely it is because they bear an easily ascertained relation to native standards, or have some superior monetary value, as in the case of English sovereigns on the Continent. Even then one would be surprised at two Frenchmen contracting to pay in English money. On the other hand, if Assyrian money was mere bullion, and Carchemish money coined, a good cause for the custom is seen at once. We have seen above that if Assyria had coin, it was probably not a silver mina; hence perhaps the preference for the Carchemish silver mina. If this was coined, it would be preferred to the Assyrian bullion mina, although its difference in value made it incapable of quite displacing it.

Having set out at some length, and with some pains to avoid technical arguments, the considerations which go to suggest the use of coins in Assyria, I must glance at the

negative evidence against this view. Hitherto nothing that can be called an Assyrian coin has come to Europe. So far as it goes that sounds damaging. But it goes a very little way indeed. I need not say that one good example of an Assyrian coin would destroy it all; for as long as the one example is to seek, its force remains. In any case it proves too much. Whatever be thought of the above arguments, they absolutely prove the use of separate money pieces, either in bars or cakes, if not coins. Yet no such shekel or mina bar is producible. The reason is not hard to find. Assyria as a whole has not been widely explored. Nineveh and Kalah, Khorsabad and a few other places have yielded much. Yet in each place it was the palace that was explored, or the temple. Now of all places the palace or the temple would be most thoroughly plundered. Private dwelling-houses may yet preserve their small hoards, but a treasury would be easily found. Buried treasure is the mania of the Oriental; no great mound probably remains that has not been ransacked for ages, if it was not stripped almost immediately after its formation.

How thoroughly the Assyrian palaces have been swept of all precious metals may be judged from the very small amount of gold and silver in the Assyrian antiquities of our museums. The cupidity of the native diggers was doubtless a factor in the result. They could not secrete colossi, but coins. We cannot doubt that the palaces of Nineveh were stored with all manner of gold and silver vessels. What value would be attached to an argument from their absence from our museums?

It may not be without weight that the later names for Jewish and Syrian moneys are suggestive of Assyrian rather than Greek or Persian origin. The mina is certainly of Assyrian origin, and the shekel also. The *parsu* or half-mina, the *zusa* or drachma, are also suggestive of Assyria. The usual Syriac word for the coin called *στατήρ* by the

Greeks is, as Professor Jensen pointed out to me, hardly derived from the Greek. It more probably represents a coin once called an Ishtar. Such a coin, bearing as its device the head of Ištar of Nineveh, is very likely meant by the often-named *rešê ša Ištar*; literally, "heads of Ishtar."

It seems, therefore, somewhat hazardous to rely on the often-repeated assertion that Lydia was the first to use coin. That Herodotus meant this is doubtful; and while a real coin of unquestioned Assyrian coinage alone could put the matter beyond doubt, we may await its discovery with considerable confidence.

C. H. W. JOHNS.

THE SHEEP AND THE GOATS.¹

“But when the Son of man shall come in His glory, and all the angels with Him, then shall He sit on the throne of His glory, and before Him shall be gathered all the nations, and He shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats; and he shall set the sheep on His right hand, but the goats on the left.”—MATT. xxv. 31-33.

IN this great prophecy, with which St. Matthew closes our Lord's active ministry, our Lord's eye has first fallen upon the immediate future, the judgment that is to pass upon the Jewish race; Jerusalem is to be destroyed and the time is not uncertain; it may be anticipated as surely as we can know that summer is nigh by the budding and foliage of the fig tree. “This generation shall not pass till all *these* things (ταῦτα πάντα) be accomplished.” Then His eye has taken a wider range; He has looked forward to a more distant and a more comprehensive judgment; but the date of that is uncertain; of that day (περὶ ἡμέρας ἐκείνης) knoweth no man; it will be as little anticipated as the flood had been; and the parables of the faithful and wise servant, of the virgins, and of the talents, show the nature and standard of the judgment that is to pass upon Christians. Then, in the words of the text, a new scene in the drama is opened: “*but* when the Son of man shall come in His glory and all the angels with Him, then shall He sit on the throne of His glory.” It is not clear that a different time is intended, but it is clear that a new case is being ushered in for trial, that the Judge has once more taken His place upon the judgment-seat: Who then are they who now stand at the bar? “Before Him shall be gathered all the nations.” The words

¹ A sermon preached before the University of Oxford, on October 15th, 1899, the first Sunday of the Academical year.

are ambiguous, but I cannot help thinking that the more modern view of their interpretation is right. This view has been advocated by several commentators, and by none better than by that vigorous, human-hearted, thoughtful, interesting, and spiritual theologian, Dr. Bruce, of Glasgow,¹ who has done so much to help us to understand the parables of the New Testament, and whose loss we have lately mourned. It is that we have here Christ's judgment on the heathen world. The judgment on the Jewish nation is over; the judgment on the Christian Church is over; it is the heathen and the heathen alone who are being tried. The title given to the Judge supports this view: He is not only the Son of man, which expresses the widest contact with all human nature, but He is also *the King*—and the title is used here of Him for the first time—the title which expresses the thought of universal imperial rule. The surprise of both the good and the bad—"when saw we thee?"—is most natural in the mouths of those who have never heard of Christ in their lives; and, most strongly of all, the standard by which they are tried favours this interpretation; the standard is that of the simplest instincts of our common humanity: have they done, or have they failed to do, acts of kindness? It is the same standard by which Eliphaz the Temanite thought to condemn Job, the great type of Gentile character in the Old Testament. "Is not thy wickedness great? neither is there any end to thy iniquities. . . . Thou hast not given water to the weary to drink, and thou hast withholden bread from the hungry, . . . thou hast sent widows away empty, and the arms of the fatherless have been broken: therefore snares are round about thee and sudden fear troubleth thee" (Job xxii. 5-9). It is akin to the sacred importance attached to the duty of hospitality in many heathen nations, and notably among the Semitic tribes. "From the earliest times of Semitic

¹ *Expositor's Bible, ad loc.*

life the lawlessness of the desert, in which every stranger is an enemy, has been tempered by the principle that the guest is inviolable. A man is safe in the midst of enemies as soon as he enters a tent or even touches the tent-rope. To harm a guest or refuse him hospitality is an offence against honour which covers the perpetrator with indelible shame.”¹ Crabbe, basing his poem on the tales of European travellers in Africa, has made the African negress soliloquize in exactly this spirit as she takes pity on the wayworn traveller:—

“What though so pale his haggard face,
 So sad and sunk his looks,” she cries,
 “And far unlike our nobler race
 With crisped locks and rolling eyes?
 Yet misery marks him of our kind;
 We see him lost, alone, afraid;
 And pangs of body, griefs of mind,
 Pronounce him man and ask our aid.”

When we consider, further, that the thought of the judgment on the heathen was a common one in Jewish prophecy and apocalypse, it would be surprising that our Lord should not have dealt with it anywhere. Indeed, the language of St. Matthew may be based upon that of the great scene of judgment in the prophecy of Joel: “Let the nations bestir themselves and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat: for there will I sit to judge all the nations (*πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*) round about” (iii. 12). But how striking is the contrast between the vengeance taken on the heathen nations in those apocalypses and the discrimination of this judgment, with its unequalled tenderness and severity! The recognition of the possibilities of heathen repentance and salvation, in the book of Jonah, approaches nearest to it in the Old Testament.

It is, then, the heathen who are being tried “without

¹ W. Robertson Smith: *The Religion of the Semites*, p. 76.

law" by their conformity to human instincts; and the parable illustrates the saying of our Lord in St. John's Gospel, "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice; and they shall become one flock, one shepherd" (x. 16). Thus far the parable seems clear, but one point remains doubtful, and that is the persons to whom the heathen have or have not shown kindness. When our Lord says, "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of *these my brethren*, even these least, ye did it unto Me," He may be thinking of *Christians*; and thus the judgment will be only upon the heathen for their treatment of *Christians* in trouble. We shall picture our Lord standing with the Christians at His side, and the heathen brought up in front for trial; and "*these my brethren*" will be a sharp antithesis to "*you.*" Or He may be thinking more widely of all men as His brethren, and the scope of the judgment will be wider. We shall picture Him with all the heathen "round about" (Joel iii. 12), He sitting in the centre to judge them for their conduct to each other.

There is much in the Old Testament analogies of the judgment on the heathen for their treatment of the Jews in captivity, as well as in the ordinary use in the New Testament of the term "*brethren*," which favours the former view. On the other hand, it is perfectly natural that our Lord at such a moment should have identified Himself with all humanity. In the former case we should think of such instances as Rahab welcoming the Jewish spies, the woman of Sarepta feeding the prophet Elisha, Ebedmelech the Ethiopian rescuing the prophet Jeremiah, or the barbarians of Melita showing the shipwrecked Paul no common kindness. In the latter case we may include all loyal worshippers of Ζεύς ξένιος, all doers of kindness the whole world over, all who in entertaining strangers have entertained angels, and more than angels, unaware.

When once the true interpretation is seized, several inferences follow of the greatest interest and import.

1. In the first place there is a negative inference. It is not fair to infer, as is sometimes done, from this parable that the ultimate test for Christians is supplied here.

It is said sometimes that the stress laid by Christians on faith is unjustified because in the ultimate resort our Lord condemns only for failing to do kind deeds. Not so. That is the ultimate standard only for the heathen; no doubt Christians must also reach it, but for them there lies also beyond it the deeper tests supplied by the previous parables which imply faith in Christ as the Bridegroom and the Master. That is the lowest pass standard, and they are candidates for honours.

2. More positively,—it is scarcely necessary to point out the claim which the Lord makes for Himself here. His presence is in every Christian, perhaps in every human being. To help forward the cause of humanity, to aid any single person in trouble is help to Him. He is present, He is conscious, He is grateful, He is mindful of every such deed. But it is more interesting to point out how we have in this scene a great picture of His attitude towards the other religions of the world, and therein a guidance for ourselves. It is often surely to many of us a perplexity in modern days to know quite what is our right relation to the good that lies outside our own circle. Whatever body we belong to, if we belong to the Church of England, if we belong to the far more comprehensive Church of Rome, if we form smaller sects of those drawn together by a close adherence to some one side of truth, there is always the contrast between the narrow circle which seems to contain the fullest embodiment of truth and the large mass of the world that lies outside it. No less striking a contrast must have presented itself to the minds of the Twelve as they sat on the slopes of Mount Olivet, and felt sure that their Teacher had the words

of truth more fully than all other teachers in the world; and in this parable they would have heard His judgment on all the millions of mankind that lay outside their own "little flock."

Let us note it carefully.

(a) There is a thorough recognition of the good. All the nations will contribute to the saved; they will have their sheep to stand on the King's right hand. So it was that St. Paul could speak of God as Saviour of all men, and not only of those who have conscious faith; and could contemplate Gentiles doing by nature the things of the law, and acquitted in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men. So Justin Martyr met the objection that Christ could not benefit those who lived in pre-Christian times by that which he quotes as already the traditional teaching of the Church (*ἐδιδάχθημεν*)—that Christ existed before all creation, that He was the reason in which every race of mankind had share, and that those who lived in harmony with reason are Christians, even if called godless, whether among the Greeks, like Socrates and Heracleitus, or among the Jews like Abraham, Ananias, Azariah, Misael and Elijah (Apol. i. 46). So Clement of Alexandria treated philosophy as given to be a schoolmaster to lead the Greeks to Christ, as the law had been given to the Jews (Strom. i. 5). Our problem has been the problem of all the Christian ages, and it has been, nearly always, solved in the same way; and ours is only more difficult that we have to recognise this good, this possibility of salvation, not only in those who have not heard of Christ, but in those who have heard of Him and rejected Him. We have to admit that the rejection of some presentations of Christianity may prove a schoolmaster to lead men and women to Christ.

In the last vacation there has passed away in Richard Congreve, at the time of his death an Honorary Fellow of Wadham College, one who, reared here in Christianity,

sacrificed all his earthly prospects by renouncing it in the interest of what seemed to him the highest truth, and devoted his whole life to the service of humanity. "The key to his life" (it was said over his grave) was faith in, fidelity to, the greatest of humanity's servants." What though he thought that the name of that servant was Auguste Comte? Surely, in spite of that mistake, the Father has a blessing for him too, and he will know that he has really been serving one greater than Comte.

(b) Further, in our recognition of the good, our clue is *love*. Do the actions, does the teaching, lead to brotherhood? Each act of kindness is an implicit recognition that self is no longer our centre, that others have claims upon us. The Greek philosophy, the life in harmony with reason, was a recognition of this on the intellectual side; the standard of right action was to be something beyond that of the individual's own judgment, it was the universal reason in which others had share. The Jewish law proclaimed the same on the moral side, the love of God and our neighbour taking the place of self. The Semitic bond of hospitality was a recognition of a duty to those who lay outside the narrow limits of family or of tribe: and so, in a lower stage, each simple act of kindness is an act of unselfishness, of submission to the claims of others; it is the germ of that absolute surrender to Christ, to that power outside ourselves, who has a right to claim our full allegiance—which is faith. It is ever expansive, for, in the words of Mr. Congreve, "the progress in love is, in fact, the only form of progress which may be kept up to the end. Our natural powers diminish and our intellect loses its force, but in love we may all advance to the end." "Faith itself," wrote Dr. Hort, in explaining the 13th Article (*Life and Letters*, ii. p. 337), not being an intellectual assent to propositions, but an attitude of heart and mind, is present in a more or less rudimentary state in

every upward effort and aspiration of men. Doubtless, the faith of non-Christians is not, in the strict sense, faith in Jesus Christ . . . but such faith, when ripened, grows into the faith of Jesus Christ; so it finds its rational justification in the revelation made through Him. The principle of the Article teaches us to regard all the good there is in the world as what one may call imperfect Christianity, not as something essentially different, requiring, so to speak, to be dealt with by God in a wholly different manner." Our Lord has taught us, then, to see in every doer of kindness—

Heaven's possible novitiates
 With self-subduing freedom free.
 * * * *
 Each of secret kingly blood,—
 Though not inheritors as yet
 Of all their own right royal things.

There is a kingdom already prepared for them, into which the King will, in due time, admit them.

But such recognition of good does not imply any light-hearted optimistic view that one religion is as good as another, and that each may be left to work out his own salvation. Soon after this parable was spoken, the Lord draws the Twelve apart to the upper chamber: there He makes them realize their separation from the world, and in that separation the closeness of their tie with them, the strength of the bond of true brotherhood, the certainty of a full knowledge of truth: He prays not for the world, but for them and for those who shall believe on Him through their preaching; and, before His Ascension, He sends them out to make disciples of all the nations. The very same races, the *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, who, while left to their own religions and their own instincts, will contribute their quota to the kingdom, are yet to be evangelized and made disciples, made learners of new truths.

There can be little doubt that the great motive of missionary work has often been something very different from this: it has been assumed that the heathen as such were necessarily lost, and the motive has been a generous self-sacrificing desire to save them from this terrible fate. We cannot, in the light of the parable, make the appeal for mission work exactly in this form. Yet, surely, sufficient reason for continued and increased effort remains.

For, in the first place, the simple human instincts of kindness and generosity may degenerate. The Bishop of Melanesia has told us, not long ago, how within the memory of living man the natives of one of the Melanesian islands have learnt from their neighbours the habits of cannibalism: and Sir Alfred Lyall's *Asiatic Studies* have been reiterating for us afresh the certainty at the present moment of the decay of Hinduism under the solvent of European education, and the danger to moral progress implied in this decay.

Again, the purpose of missionary work is to complete and carry forward these germinal instincts into their full development. This is what the King is represented as doing in the parable: He leads the heathen forward to understand the unity of all human nature and its consummation in Himself; and so, if we turn to that beautiful description of Burmese Buddhism, which has lately been depicted in Mr. Fielding's *The Soul of a People*, we cannot rise from the book without feeling both the strength and beauty of the love, the brotherhood, fostered by it, and yet its need of extension and deepening. On the one hand, we have the teaching of the Buddha himself, "the teaching of love, charity, and compassion, eternal love, perfect charity, endless compassion," given by "the teacher of the Great Peace"; there is the persevering quest after truth on his part—"he sought on till he found, and what he found he gave as an heritage to men for ever, that the

way might be easier for them than it had been for him": there is, too, the great compassionate respect of the masses of the people for religion as manifested in the mendicant monks. And yet, how wanting this religion is, in some points, even with respect to brotherhood! It places woman on a lower religious level than man; it fails to satisfy her instincts of prayer for those whom she loves; it stands apart from daily life and does not consecrate the marriage tie; it has no message for the dying man; and, therefore, it has to be supplemented by practices drawn from more primitive beliefs.

What a sphere then here for missionary work! There the alphabet of the gospel of love has been learnt. Can we recognise it? can we train its learners to put the letters together till they spell out that name in which there is, in which there can be, neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female, the name Christ Jesus? Certainly it can only be, if we are bringing them the religion of a fuller brotherhood and a completer love.

This parable may seem to have little bearing upon us to-day, who are starting on a new academical year. We shall indeed be tried by higher standards than this. The test of an University life will be found rather in the parables of the virgins and of the talents. Shall we show the ready wisdom of the wise virgins? shall we keep the lamps of hope and enthusiasm which we bring from school supplied with fresh oil? shall we have the ready alertness to welcome truth coming at unexpected moments and in unexpected ways? Shall we trade faithfully with the talents which our Master has entrusted to our care? Shall we keep up a high ideal of God's nature and the blessing of His service? or shall we allow our slothfulness to degrade our conception of God Himself till we think Him "a hard man"? These are the questions which we shall have to answer, and yet even the simple lesson of the sheep and the goats has its

reference to us. There are problems of the true methods of charity on which we should be making up our minds. There are in college life the lonely and the unpopular, to whom a word of sympathy may be everything; there is often among us "a famine in the land, not a famine of bread nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord" (Amos viii. 11); there are those who long to see their way through perplexity and difficulty, and in helping them we are helping Christ. St. Augustine finely paraphrases our Lord's words in this application, and he makes Him say, *Cum unus ex minimis meis discit, ego disco*.¹ That saying is a word of encouragement for us teachers. If our college sermons touch the heart and kindle it into the desire of service, if our philosophy fosters moral discipline and a real love of truth, if our political economy leaves us better instructed in brotherhood, if our theology makes us reverent towards God, then the Christ is learning in each pupil, His needs are being satisfied, His powers of service are being enlarged.

It is a word of encouragement and stimulus also for pupils. Look beyond your studies to those to whom you in after life will be called to minister. Make your studies sound, sure, real, that you may have bread and not a stone to give to those who ask you. See that you keep up your hope and faith in truth, that you may be able to speak "a word to the weary." Deepen your own character, that it may be a strength to others. Know yourselves as well as your books; for in the words of St. Bernard: ²

"There are many who know many things, but know not their own characters. They criticise others, and neglect themselves; they seek God by external evidences, and they know not the internal evidence of their own heart, where God is enshrined deeper within.

¹ In Joh. Tr. XXI. cap. v.

² In Cantica, Serm. xxxvi.

“For there are some who wish for knowledge only for knowledge’s sake, and that is unworthy curiosity.

“And there are some who wish for knowledge that they may be known to possess it, and that is unworthy vanity.

“There are, too, those who wish for knowledge as a source of gain, and that is unworthy trafficking.

“But there are also those who wish for knowledge that they may edify others, and that is charity.

“There are, too, those who wish for knowledge that they may be edified, and that is wisdom.”

WALTER LOCK.

A CRITICISM OF THE NEW CHRONOLOGY OF PAUL.

(Concluded.)

OUR argument in the two preceding articles has issued in the following conclusions: 1. The positive argument of O. Holtzmann and his followers is valueless; 2. The Eusebian chronology advocated by Blass, if at all admissible, must be modified, not by the subtraction of a year to make it agree with the results of Holtzmann, as proposed by Harnack, but by the addition of a year. This will not only satisfy the three synchronisms which Ramsay has shown to be still valid, but will also meet the true requirements of the calendar argument, in regard to which he has been misled by a too exclusive dependence upon Lewin. Curiously, the two alternative dates for Paul’s arrest, 55 or 58, which our review of the calendar argument has left as the only possibilities, are just the two between which we should be forced to choose according as we adopted the (properly modified) Eusebian dating, or were influenced by the objections of the dominant school of Wieseler, Lewin, Schürer, Lightfoot, Ewald, Weizsäcker, Wendt and others

to reject entirely his authority in favour of an independent reckoning of their own.

We are justified in speaking of the date 55 A.D. for Paul's arrest as supported by "the authority of Eusebius," in spite of the fact that strictly his date, "the second year of Nero," for the accession of Festus, would imply Pentecost 54 for the arrest, because, as Harnack observes (*l.c.*, p. 238), "Even with the best chronologers we must frequently allow a margin of error of *one* year, as they have different reckonings of the years of the emperors."¹ And if it be permissible to subtract a year with Harnack from Eusebius' dates and still appeal to his authority, we have equal warrant for appealing to it after adding a year in order to bring them into conformity with the statements of Orosius, Tacitus, Seneca, and Josephus, and the requirements of the calendar argument.

The question thus becomes much simpler. It resolves itself into the following: Can the Eusebian chronology, as vindicated by Blass with the able support and full supplementation of Harnack, and as modified by ourselves in accord with the foregoing considerations, be still maintained? or have the objections of the dominant school so much weight that we must cut loose from the direct testimony of antiquity, declaring, with the blunt frankness of Schürer, "The statements in the Chronicle of Eusebius are often quite arbitrary, and so prove nothing"?

If Harnack has shown wisdom in bringing to the support of Blass the weight of his wonderful industry, insight, and erudition, he has also proved his wonted keenness, in spite of some superficial oversights, in resorting to O. Holtzmann for an independent and parallel argument against the dominant school. For Holtzmann, although unfortunately mis-

¹ We might cite in illustration the well-known case of Josephus, who notoriously produces confusion by his vacillation between the years of the consuls (Jan. 1-Jan. 1) and the years of the reigning emperors.

led in relying upon Josephus for his positive argument in a passage where the Jewish annalist certainly errs, has rendered admirable service on the negative side by his concise and lucid exposure of the surprising weakness of the modern objections to Eusebius' dating. With Harnack we may avail ourselves of this rebuttal, since no objections of importance appear save those which Schürer advances.¹ Says Harnack (*l.c.*, p. 235), "So far as I can see, all that restrains Schürer from going back so far [as 56 A.D. for the recall of Felix, *i.e.* 54 for Paul's arrest] is the following. He says (1) that Josephus places almost all he has to relate of the activity of Felix under the reign of Nero (*Ant.* xx. 8, 1-9; *Bell.* ii. 12, 8-14, 1). Felix accordingly must have still held office for at least some years under Nero. But Eusebius himself does not place his recall earlier than the second year of Nero, and it cannot be maintained that what Josephus relates cannot have taken place within this limit of time."²

¹ In Zahn's *Einleitung in d. N.T.*, the first volume of which has just appeared, we are promised a discussion of the Problem of the Chronology in Excursus II., to appear in vol. ii. Here we may expect full and able restatement of the objections to the Eusebian chronology, for the dates adopted in vol. i. make it clear that Zahn supports the dominant view.

² The events related by Josephus (*l.c.*) of the administration of Felix under Nero are the following: 1. Capture of certain robbers and impostors, including Eleazar, son of Dineus, whom he sent to Rome. 2. Felix procures the assassination of Jonathan the high priest by the Sicarii, who thereafter commit murders at the feasts almost with impunity. 3. Among other impostors and agitators there comes to Jerusalem "about this time" an Egyptian "false prophet," whom Felix attacks with a body of cavalry and puts to flight, together with his followers, four hundred of whom are slain. 4. Felix interposes in a quarrel between the Jewish and Syrian citizens of Cæsarea, both parties sending delegates to Nero. The Syrians bribe Burrus (*sic*), but the Jews would have won their case and secured redress for the violence done them by Felix save for the intervention of Pallas, who was then in the height of favour with Nero. [This is the debated synchronism of Holtzmann. It will be observed how very dubious is the connection in which it stands: The Jews would have been shown quite in the right against the Syrians and Felix but for the bribing of Burrus, Nero's secretary, for his Greek letters, and the paramount influence of Pallas! We have seen that if this controversy in Rome be assumed to have taken place after the accession of Festus, as is implied in

The other (2) objection of Schürer to the Eusebian dating is the reference of Paul in Acts xxiv. 10 to Felix's experience as a judge in matters of Jewish law, ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν. To this Harnack merely replies that if, as Eusebius states, Felix had been appointed in A.D. 51, and Paul stood before him in 54, the expression is justified, because 3-4 years for a procurator are not few, although longer administrations are known, and Schürer himself admits that less than six years would suffice. It seems strange, however, that Harnack should not avail himself of the defence of Holtzmann, especially as the date for Paul's appearance before Felix, which Harnack himself is really upholding, is not the Eusebian 54 A.D., but 53, which certainly does not justify the expression ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν if Felix was appointed in 51. Holtzmann, however, is justified at least in assuming that Felix's experience in Palestinian affairs is not limited by this date; for not only was his appointment obtained at the solicitation of the high priest Jonathan above-mentioned, who must accordingly have had opportunity of knowing him, presumably in Palestine, but there is explicit testimony of Tacitus on this point, which is preferred by Mommsen to that of Josephus. Prof. Ramsay, in fact, expresses what we judge to be the mind of scholars on this point in his note on the Procuratorship of Felix, appended to chapter xiii. of *Paul the Traveller*, which we transcribe. "The remarkable contradiction between Josephus (who

Ant. xx. 8, 9, the date of Pallas' fall makes the allusion to his favour with Nero a pure anachronism. But in *Bell.* ii. 13, 7, Josephus represents that the delegates of both parties were sent to Nero by Felix himself, which agrees better in some respects with the account in *Ant.* xx. 8, 9. In either case the recall of Felix was subsequent to the fall of Pallas.] 5. "About this time" Agrippa II. gave the high priesthood to Ishmael ben Fabi, which resulted in unrestrained strife of the priestly factions and seizure of the tithes. It is obvious that Harnack is justified in his assertion that Eusebius' date leaves room for these events, though it is not so easy to see how there would be room *after subtracting a year*, as Harnack proposes. The *addition* of a year, as we propose, will of course leave ample room for all five of the above-mentioned events, especially as the fifth cannot be far separated from the second.

makes Cumanus governor of Palestine 48–52, Felix being his successor in 52), and Tacitus (who makes Felix governor of Samaria [and probably of Judæa], contemporary with Cumanus as governor of Galilee, the latter being disgraced in 52, and the former acquitted and honoured at the same trial), is resolved by Mommsen in favour of Tacitus as the better authority on such a point; and most students of Roman history will agree with him." We may add that Josephus, in more than one instance, shows greater exactitude in his earlier work, and that here the singular omission of Judæa in *Bell.* ii. 12, 8 from the list of provinces put under Felix after the removal of Cumanus, in contrast with *Ant.* xx. 7, 1 *seq.*, where Judæa stands for all three, may possibly indicate that Josephus' disagreement with Tacitus on this point may have been occasioned by simple misunderstanding of Justus of Tiberias, who seems to have been his authority for the dates of accession of the procurators.

If any doubt remains in the reader's mind as to the propriety of Paul's congratulating himself in 54 that he had in Felix a judge of "many years'" experience in Jewish affairs, we must refer him to the argument of Holtzmann (*l.c.*, § 16, 5). In any event, there can be no difficulty in the ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν for those who *add* a year to the Eusebian dating, and think of Paul as speaking in 55 A.D.

If we defer the application of our dates to the relative chronology, these two are actually the only objections to the Eusebian dating which Harnack is able to discover in Schürer's exhaustive pages. Nor can we ourselves add anything of consequence from other representatives of the dominant chronology.¹ But if these objections are insig-

¹ It is generally admitted that no chronological inference can be drawn from Josephus' employment of the term γυνή of Poppæa in *Ant.* xx. 8, 11. True, she was not married to Nero until 62 A.D., but her influence began in 58, and might avail for the deputation which sought a revocation of Festus' order requiring the demolition of the wall built to frustrate the curiosity of Agrippa

nificant as against the chronology of Eusebius taken strictly, or even when modified by the subtraction of a year, they can have no weight whatever against a dating which brings it down by the addition of a year.

But Schürer considers the relative chronology of Paul's life to be an insuperable obstacle. In view of the chronological arrangements of the life of Paul on the basis of the Eusebian or even an earlier chronology, already current, it would seem almost superfluous to point out that the periods enumerated in our first article, as to which a general agreement exists, are not incompatible with this form of the Eusebian dating. Nevertheless, it will be well to cast a glance over the result.¹ Starting from Paul's arrest in Jerusalem at Pentecost 55 A.D., the five-year period back to his arrival in Corinth will bring us to the same season of the year 50, which agrees exactly with the inferences of our second article, drawn from the synchronisms of the Orosian date for the Claudian edict and that obtained from Seneca and Tacitus for the proconsulship of Gallio. In the latter case our inference was that "the arrival of Paul in Corinth was *not earlier* than the beginning of A.D. 49." In the

II., at any time between these dates. It would seem to have been exerted toward the close of Festus' administration; and, were it possible to hold, on the ground of the paucity of events assigned to it by Josephus, that this administration was very short, we might argue hence with Holtzmann (*l.c.*, p. 129), that "its beginning should apparently be placed not later than 55, its end not earlier than 58." But "blessed is the people whose history is short." The appointment of Festus was one of those excellent ones which made the early years of Nero's reign a "golden quinquennium," and few of those disturbances Josephus is concerned to narrate can have marred its tranquility. As against the silence of both Tacitus and Josephus as to the length of this and the preceding and following administrations, we have the positive statement of the Eusebian Chronicle that "Albinus succeeded Festus in the seventh year of Nero" (=A.D. 61; Jerome the same; *Arm.*, A.D. 60), and this date is accepted by Schürer ("at the latest, A.D. 62"), so that the administration of Festus would really have been of the rather exceptional length of 4-5 years. No inference, accordingly, can be drawn from the passage.

¹ For the periods here referred to, see the first article of this series, *EXPOSITOR*, v. 38, p. 125.

former we found a positive date for Claudius' decree, said to be derived from Josephus, though not now extant in that author. In consequence of this decree, Aquila and Prisca had left Rome, reaching Corinth shortly (*προσφατώς*) before Paul (Acts xviii. 2). For their journey from Rome we need allow but a week; for the interval covered by the *προσφατώς* but a few weeks more. Orosius' date for the decree, after the necessary correction of one year already explained, is 50 A.D., precisely the year to which we are carried back by our five-year period before the arrest.

The second visit of Paul to Jerusalem (third of Acts), referred to in Galatians ii. 1 *seq.*, commonly spoken of as the occasion of the Apostolic Convention, is generally placed "some seven or eight years" earlier than the arrest.¹ Our modified Eusebian dating would give us accordingly the spring of 48 or 47 A.D., to which there can be no objection, even if Prof. McGiffert's suggestion were adopted, which identifies this visit with that of Acts xi. 30. Paul's *διακονία* will then have occupied the winter of A.D. 46-47 or 47-48; for, as we have seen in the preceding article, even the winter of 47-48 is not excluded from the possibilities. For the present we can only say an error on the part of the writer of Acts is made certain by the positive and emphatic assertions of Paul; but whether he erred in taking two versions of the same visit which lay before him for two separate visits, or in assuming that Paul must have been one of the administrators of the relief sent by the Antiochian believers to those of Jerusalem, we cannot now decide. The modified Eusebian chronology admits both possibilities.

The same applies to the period between Paul's conversion and the Apostolic Convention. Whether it be taken at the maximum of seventeen or at the minimum of fourteen

¹ McGiffert (*l.c.*, p. 359).

years will make no difference to our dating. In the former case the conversion will have taken place in 31 A.D., within two years of the Ascension. But even so, there is time enough in two years for such a degree of ecclesiastical development as appears in Acts vi. 1 *seq.*, and for "the persecution which arose about Stephen." We can hardly say as much for the dates which subtract a year from the Eusebian.

Of course no obstacles are encountered by this chronology in the relative chronology of the time after Paul's arrest. Its two periods of two and one-half years each bring us respectively to the fast of Acts xxvii. 9, spent near Crete, and to the end of the two years in Rome of Acts xxviii. 30. We thus lose sight of Paul in the early spring of A.D. 60, with ample time for a release and second imprisonment before the Neronian persecution of the fall of 64, in case the data of the Pastoral Epistles should seem to require it.

All that could properly be asked of the Eusebian chronology is that it should encounter no serious obstacle in the relative chronology of the life of Paul. The result of our cursory review, adopting the generally accepted intervals, goes much further. The year 55 A.D. for Paul's arrest affords exactly that happy medium which avoids the crowding of the events of Acts i.-viii., incurred under the chronology of Holtzmann, Blass, Harnack and McGiffert, and the crowding out of the possible journeys to Spain, Crete, Ephesus, and Troas, and other events witnessed to by tradition and perhaps by the genuine material of the Pastoral Epistles, necessitated by the needlessly late dating of the dominant school. In short, there is no dating which, while all the debated questions are left open, so readily adapts itself as this to the requirements of the relative chronology. Until further evidence is forthcoming we can but consider that the objections raised to this form of the Eusebian

dating are without foundation, and that as between the two possible years for Paul's arrest left open by the calendar argument, A.D. 55 and A.D. 58, the former is that which most nearly meets the historical requirements.

Thus far in the present article we have simply undertaken to defend the chronology of ancient tradition against the objections of the dominant school. We have still to consider certain positive evidence in its favour, in addition to that of the date of the Claudian edict in Orosius, and to apply our results to the relative chronology upon our own interpretation of the Scriptural data.

It was intimated at the close of our first article that Josephus, even if guilty of an anachronism in his report of the intervention of Pallas with Nero (*Ant.* xx. 8, 9), might still afford some indication of date through the limit of error he would be unlikely to overpass. As our choice of dates for the recall of Felix rests between the years 57 and 60, it is surely more probable, considering the importance of the events, that in the clause *μάλιστα δὴ τότε διὰ τιμῆς ἄγων ἐκεῖνον* Josephus makes a slip of something over one year than one of over four years. But we have noted also that Josephus' own representation of the matter in *Bell.* ii. 13, 7 is inconsistent with that of *Ant.* xx. 8, 9. The intervention of Pallas is not referred to, but the delegates of both parties to the Cæsarean dispute are sent by Felix "to Nero." This, then, was after the beginning of 55, but, as we may possibly infer from the boldness of Felix's action, before he had received word of the downfall of his powerful brother, *i.e.* early in 55. Whether Pallas intervened or not, the decision of Burrus on this occasion was unfavourable to the Jews of Cæsarea who "went up to Rome to accuse Felix," and Nero's letter, written by the advice of Burrus, was therefore a vindication of Felix to this extent. His recall can therefore scarcely have taken place earlier than 56. But the question arises: How long could the appointee of

Claudius, a man notoriously base and corrupt, the typical example of the Claudian régime of slaves and freedmen, maintain himself in office after the downfall of Pallas? That he should have been tolerated for another year, even under the dominant influence of a Burrus and Seneca, is not inexplicable : but that he should have continued undisturbed in office throughout the golden quinquennium Neronis, and even beyond it, in spite of the loss of support in Rome and increasing complaints from his province, and *then* been followed by an excellent appointee, is surely a much less probable supposition. On this additional ground the year 57 for Felix's recall must be preferred to 60.

Finally, in addition to this and to Orosius' date for the Claudian edict, supporters of the (modified) Eusebian dating may properly avail themselves of the important suggestion of McGiffert (*l.c.*, pp. 358, 592 *seq.*) as to the traditional residence of the Apostle Peter in Rome. It is highly probable from the uniform testimony of antiquity that Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome under Nero, and to all appearance (Clem. R. VI.; Tertullian, *De Praescr. Haer.* 36; Origen, quoted by Eus. *H.E.* III. 1; Caius of Rome, *ibid.* II. 25) in the great Neronian persecution of the latter part of 64. Now the idea of a contemporary stay of Peter with Paul in Rome during the period known to us of Paul's life is really excluded by the Epistles of the Captivity; yet the figure of Peter is of so great importance among the Christians of Rome, so early even as the end of the first century, as actually to overshadow that of Paul himself. Prof. McGiffert justly argues that the fact is unaccountable, unless we allow some substantial basis to the tradition. Several years must have been spent by Peter in Rome, after the time when we lose sight of Paul, in establishing and building up that important church, which implies as many between the disappearance of Paul from the stage of Acts and the summer of 64 A.D. Neither in the relative nor in the absolute

chronology do we find, then, any valid objection whatever to the Eusebian chronology if modified by the *addition* instead of the *subtraction* of one year. On the contrary, the little that can be drawn from other sources—Orosius, the appointment of Gallio, the probable limit of error in Josephus, the tradition of Peter's stay in Rome, the relative chronology of Paul's life,¹ the intrinsic probabilities of Nero's administration—all tends to confirm this, rather than the dating which the calendar argument leaves open as the only alternative.

But have we the right to cite the tradition of antiquity in Eusebius' favour? Schürer has replied in an article in the *Zt. f. W. Th.* 1898, 1, which appeared subsequent to the completion and delivery of the present series of articles, to the argument of Harnack in favour of the independent value of Eusebius' dates. In justice to the great critical historian of New Testament times it must be admitted that his argument seems to remove all ground for the supposition that Eusebius had authority other than inference, often inaccurately drawn, from Josephus, for the secular dates of this period. The one date, however, which his argument admittedly does not touch, is just the date of essential and vital significance. Without any traceable basis in Josephus, or any assignable ground save Christian tradition, Eusebius states as an occurrence of the *second* year of Nero—not the *sixth*, as he should have said if the modern chronology were correct—"Festus was sent by Nero as successor to Felix."

We may grant every contention of Schürer against Harnack, grant that "Eusebius knows from Josephus that the appointment of Festus falls in the time of Nero, and fixes it by free (?) conjecture under the heading 'second year of Nero,'" and still the fact remains as we have stated it:

¹ For details see below.

the undisputed tradition of antiquity represents the arrest of Paul as taking place in 54 (better 55) A.D. It is not an answer to call this "free conjecture," though the weight of the testimony may be lessened. For some reason Eusebius places the arrest of Paul very early in the reign of Nero. No other reason has been suggested than the testimony of antiquity. There is no valid objection to this date. There are several independent considerations which support it. We cannot avoid the conviction that the now dominant chronology, which in modern times has undertaken to set it aside, bringing down the date of Paul's disappearance from the stage from about 60 A.D. to 63 or 64, is as erroneous as it is unjustifiable.

We have reached the conclusion of our main argument in finding an absolute chronology of the life of Paul, which, besides conforming to the verdict of antiquity, will also correspond to the relative chronology as usually adopted by modern authorities. This result we believe to be reached by fixing the arrest of Paul in Jerusalem at Pentecost 55 A.D., counting forward five years to his disappearance from the stage of Acts in 60, and backward five to his arrival in Corinth early in 50. But the assumption we have already made concerning the season of year of Paul's arrival in Corinth is at variance with the opinion of many excellent critics. This variation, and certain independent conclusions to which the course of our enquiries leads up, may justify us in asking the further attention of the reader for the few moments needful to present our own view of the history of Paul in its chronological relations.

It seems to be generally held that the journey from Corinth *viâ* Ephesus to Cæsarea (and Jerusalem?) of Acts xviii. 21, 22, was on occasion either of Passover (Ewald, Renan), or Pentecost (Wieseler, Anger); and the idea apparently underlies the tacit assumption of Ramsay (*Paul*, 2nd ed., p. 264), Harnack and McGiffert, that Paul's

arrival in Corinth, eighteen months earlier, must have been in the early fall. But the clause in Acts xviii. 21, *δεῖ με πάντως τὴν ἑορτὴν ἐρχομένην ποιῆσαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα* of the Western texts cannot possibly stand against the testimony of \aleph A B, and is rejected by nearly all textual authorities since Mill and Bengel as an importation from xix. 21, xx. 16. None of our authorities, in fact, save Ramsay, consider that there was an actual visit to Jerusalem; McGiffert regards it, with Wendt, Weizsäcker, and H. J. Holtzmann, as intrinsically inconceivable, as well as excluded by Galatians ii. 1. Blass does not even so understand the text (*ἀναβῆς* = "ex portu in oppidum"). But even if Paul did visit Jerusalem, and the visit was on occasion of a feast, so far as the text goes it might as well have been the feast of Tabernacles in the autumn as Passover or Pentecost. The grounds for placing the departure of Paul from Corinth in early spring, deduced from Acts xviii. 22, are therefore too slight to be considered; or, if there be any other, I am ignorant of it.

On the other hand, Prof. Ramsay himself informs us (EXPOSITOR, v. 5, p. 205) that the arrival of the new proconsul of Achaia "must have been in May or June . . . probably in May"; and if Gallio did not arrive before May, we are practically compelled by the narrative of Acts xviii. 11-18 to place the accusation before Gallio in the summer and Paul's departure in the early fall. This implies that his arrival was in early spring.

The result of this exacter dating of Paul's arrival in Corinth will be a limitation to five, instead of the five and one-half years which Prof. Ramsay allows, between this and the final departure from Corinth in 55 followed by Paul's arrest in Jerusalem. This we find in reality to be in much better agreement with the data of the Epistles and of Acts, particularly in regard to the year preceding Paul's last stay in Corinth (according to our reckoning the

year 54 A.D.) substantially all of which Prof. Ramsay takes to have been spent by Paul in Macedonia; for he dates the flight of Paul from Ephesus to Troas in January, the writing of 2 Corinthians in "summer" of the same year, and the arrival in Achaia in December. A moment's consideration of 2 Corinthians should suffice to show how utterly insupposable this is. From i. 8-10 it appears that Paul's frightful experience "in Asia" is so recent that his readers, but for his report, would still be "ignorant of it"; nor was he able to spend any time in Troas in spite of the promising "door there opened to him in the Lord." On the contrary, not meeting Titus there, as he had hoped, with news of the effect of his sharp letter to the Corinthians, he had pressed on into Macedonia (ii. 12, 13). But even when he and Timothy were come into Macedonia they found no relief from the torment of inward fears until "God who comforteth those that are in the depths comforted them by the coming of Titus," with such good news of the reception accorded the letter, that Paul, who in his anxiety had even regretted having written it, now regrets nothing but the sorrow he had been obliged to inflict upon them (vii. 5-16). Titus now retraces his steps, accompanied by two delegates of the Macedonian churches who had been intending to make the journey in company with Paul, bearing this letter of thankfulness and comfort, not to return again to Paul in Macedonia, but to make ready for his coming to Achaia by completing the collections which already for over a year have been in progress among the Corinthians (viii. 6, 10, 11, 16-19, 22-24; ix. 1-5).

What can be more obvious than that Paul has been spurred on throughout his journey from "Asia" to Macedonia by an anxiety to hear from the Corinthians amounting almost to agony, and that now that Titus has arrived bringing the good news, he will not keep them waiting for his promised coming (i. 15-ii. 1) longer than is absolutely

necessary. In fact the three forerunners of his coming have need of diligence in their work, lest Paul coming after in company with certain Macedonians find them unprepared, and so "he (that he say not they) be put to shame" in regard to his boasting that Achaia has been ready since a year past (ix. 3-5). For short as has been his stay in Macedonia (i. 8 *seq.*) the collections there are already complete (viii. 1-5, 23). Even if we place at this time that further extension of the Macedonian field which carried Paul to the borders of Illyricum (Rom. xv. 19), it is utterly impossible to suppose an entire year to have elapsed between the escape from "Asia" to which 2 Corinthians i. 8 *seq.* looks back, and the arrival in Corinth to which ix. 4 looks forward. If we allow five or six months, we are extending the limits of this journey to the utmost. The escape from Ephesus must therefore have occurred about midsummer, A.D. 54. The reason why Paul did not go to Corinth direct as he had proposed, while he still had confidence in their loyalty (i. 14 *seq.*), but reverted to the plan formed more than a year before (1 Cor. xvi. 5-9; cf. xvi. 1 *seq.* with 2 Cor. viii. 10, ix. 2) is plainly and very emphatically stated in 2 Corinthians i. 23-ii. 1. The "visit in sorrow" threatened in 1 Corinthians iv. 21 had taken place, doubtless direct from Ephesus, with results which called forth the letter "written out of much affliction and anguish of heart" (2 Cor. ii. 4, vii. 8), sent after Paul's return to Ephesus (by the hand of Erastus? Cf. Tit. iii. 12; Acts xix. 22; 2 Tim. iv. 20; Rom. xvi. 23), not long before the catastrophe which drove the apostle to Troas and Macedonia. To us the arguments identifying this letter with 2 Corinthians x. 1-xiii. 10 have long seemed convincing; but even if, with Zahn (*Einleitung*, IV.), we place the whole correspondence of Paul with the Corinthians within the limits of this single year, regarding our 1 Corinthians as the letter whose sharpness Paul had him-

self regretted, we must still conclude with this admirable scholar (*l.c.*, § 19, p. 221), "From 2 Corinthians viii. 9 we can only infer that Paul will not keep them long waiting for his coming, for he does not expect Titus to return. The two deputies of the churches make the first part of the journey it had been intended they should make in company with Paul, somewhat earlier than he, and in company with Titus instead of Paul."

If the departure from Ephesus be placed in the summer of 54, there can be little difference of opinion as to the three-year period of Paul's activity in Asia (Acts xx. 31) counted, so far as appears, by all our authorities as dating from the arrival by ship from Cenchreæ (Acts xviii. 18), and inclusive of the periods of "three months" and "two years" respectively of Acts xix. 8 and 10, as well as the (nine months?) journey of confirmation to the churches of Syria, Galatia and Phrygia (Acts xviii. 18-23).¹ Three months in Achaia (Acts xx. 3), 5-6 months for the journey thither from Ephesus, three years or slightly less for the Ephesian period, and eighteen months for the stay in Corinth will complete the five-years interval we have assumed between

¹ To us the reasoning of Zahn (*l.c.*, p. 133) seems conclusive against the contention of Ramsay limiting the phrase of τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν of Acts xvi. 6, and the corresponding τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν of xviii. 23 to the region of the churches of South Galatia. Acts xvi. 1-6 seems to us, on the contrary, to describe a missionary tour of Paul and Silas from the already established South-Galatian churches as a base, northward through the region of "Phrygia and Galatia" (in the Lucan sense) as far as the borders of Asia on the west and Bithynia on the north. If there is evidence of "haste" in the narrative, it is quite as likely to reflect the haste of the author hurrying from comparatively unknown events to the full light of his incomparable "we source" in v. 10, as the haste of Paul and Silas for inexplicable reasons on their journey. It is this extension of the South-Galatian mission field as well as the original churches of Lycaonia and Pisidia which Paul revisits and confirms, καθέξῃς, in Acts xviii. 23, viz., "both the Galatian and the Phrygian," or "and Phrygia." The time at his disposal, even after a lengthy stay in Syria (v. 23a) was adequate; for the events which, according to Acts xviii. 24-xix. 1, were taking place at Ephesus and Corinth in the meantime can hardly be supposed to occupy less than 6-9 months.

Paul's first coming to Corinth early in 50 A.D. and his final departure thence shortly before Passover in 55. If this does not meet the conditions of the relative chronology of the second and third missionary journeys, the alternative must be to take the date of Orosius for the Claudian edict as it stands, without correction, and place the coming of Paul to Corinth in the autumn of 49. In either case we have obtained an absolute chronology for the entire period of Paul's literary activity, centering in his arrest at Jerusalem, Pentecost 55 A.D., extending forward five years to his disappearance from the stage of history at Rome in the spring of A.D. 60, and backward another five years to his arrival in Corinth on his second missionary journey in the spring of 50 A.D., or possibly a few months earlier.

Whether we carry back the Jerusalem Conference two years or three before this time is of secondary importance, and will depend principally on the length of time required for the stay in Antioch after the Conference, Acts xv. 30-35, during which occurred the painful incident of Galatians ii. 11-21; and for the portion of the second missionary journey not covered by the Travel Document (Acts xv. 36-xvi. 8; see note above).

The possibility suggested by McGiffert that the writer of Acts is in error regarding the *διακονία* of Paul in Jerusalem (Acts xi. 29, 30, xii. 25), only in regarding it as a separate occasion from that of the Jerusalem Conference (Acts xv. 1-29), is still admissible, since the winter of the famine (dated by Orosius in 45) will have been 46-47 or 47-48. According to Ramsay (*Paul*, 2nd ed. p. 51) it "set in when the harvest of 46 failed." But it is conceivable that the relief from Antioch should not have come until the pressure of a second complete failure of the crops of 47 made assistance still more imperative in the winter of 47-48, and Queen Helena of Adiabene under (Cuspius Fadus and?) Tiberius Alexander (A.D. 46-48) had set the example (*Ant.*

xx. 5, 2). The possibility or impossibility of this suggestion depends upon Prof. McGiffert's analysis of the sources of Acts, with which we have not yet been favoured. But be this as it may, the second journey of Paul to Jerusalem of Galatians ii. 1 *seq.* must have occurred from two to three years before the opening of the year 50 A.D. A further two and one-half to three years before this journey to Jerusalem were occupied by the first missionary journey in Cyprus, Pamphylia and South Galatia, *circa* A.D. 43 (44)–46 (47) (Acts xiii. 1–xiv. 28). The rest of the eleven, or fourteen, years which separated it from the first visit to Jerusalem were occupied by missionary labours "in the regions of Syria and Cilicia" (Gal. i. 21). Paul's base of operations for the first portion of this time we take to have been Damascus, as in the preceding period of "three years" between his conversion and the visit to Jerusalem "to become acquainted with Peter" (Gal. i. 18). This earliest field of Paul's missionary labours we understand to have been permanently closed to him by the episode so vividly reflected in 2 Corinthians xi. 32, 33 (somewhat differently placed by Acts ix. 23–25) which would seem to have occurred in A.D. 39 or 40. Is it only coincidence that the great vision and revelation, the account of which immediately follows in 2 Corinthians xii. 1 *seq.* (written in the autumn of 54), is said to have been given him "fourteen years ago"?

The next field of Paul's activity, if we may trust the account of Acts xi. 25, 26, was his native city of Tarsus, which doubtless became the base for his missionary work "in the regions of Cilicia"; but for some time previous to the coming of Agabus (45 A.D.?) Paul had been occupied in Antioch, whither Barnabas had brought him, and where the two laboured jointly for a year before their great missionary expedition. The resultant chronology of Paul's career will be as follows:—

	A.D.
Conversion	<i>circa</i> 31 (34 ?)
First visit to Jerusalem	„ 33 (36 ?)
Escape from Damascus	„ 39
Work in Cilicia	„ 40-42
Work in Antioch	„ 42-43
First Missionary Journey	„ 44-46
Second visit to Jerusalem	„ 47
Journey with Silas from Antioch to Macedonia	48-49
Arrival in Corinth	early spring, 50
(Epistles to Thessalonians and Galatians)	
Departure from Corinth	early autumn, 51
Tour of Syrian, Galatian and Phrygian churches	51-52
Return to Ephesus	early summer, 52
(2 Cor. vi. 14-vii. 1 and 1 Cor.)	
Visit to (Crete ?), Corinth and return	May-June, 54
(Titus-fragments (?) 2 Cor. x. 1.-xiii. 10)	
Flight from Ephesus	July-Aug., 54
Macedonia	autumn, 54
(Fragments in 1 Tim., 2 Tim. iv. 9, 11-18, 20, 21a (?) and 2 Cor.)	
Achaia	January-March, 55
(Romans)	
Arrest in Jerusalem	May, 55
Defence before Festus	midsummer, 57
Voyage to Rome	August, 57-February, 58
Imprisonment in Rome	until end of 59
(Epistles to "Ephesians," Colossians and Philemon)	
Defence before Nero	60
(Epistles to Philippians and 2 Timothy [i. 13, 14; ii. 14-iii. 17; iv. 3, 4, interpolated])	
Death of Paul	?

BENJ. W. BACON.

*MR. LEWIN AND PROF. BACON ON THE
PASSOVER.*

PROF. BACON'S paper on a subject of undying interest—the chronology of Paul—is well worth careful study but it is proposed in this place to touch only on one point, viz., his treatment of Mr. Lewin. Prof. Bacon differs from Mr. Lewin on an important chronological principle. That principle has been much discussed; and the view supported by Prof. Bacon was certainly familiar to Mr. Lewin, and rejected by him after full consideration. Yet the respected and learned American scholar apparently assumes that Mr. Lewin had not known of that view, and had unwittingly adopted a different and a false view. “There is, unfortunately, a very serious error in Lewin's determination of the incident of the Passover, which Prof. Ramsay seems not to have observed.” My fault would consist only in following with too much docility and too little inquiry the astronomical calculations of that excellent scholar and acute critic, which would be not a serious crime. My share, therefore, may be left out of this case as quite unimportant, and attention may be concentrated solely on the difference of opinion between the Yale professor and the Oxford scholar. So far as I am concerned, I have only to acknowledge gratefully Prof. Bacon's kind words about me, and to thank him cordially for his support and approval in some important points, and still more cordially for his criticism in others.

The first fault attributed to Mr. Lewin is, that he has “attempted to make the Passover full moon (astronomic) ‘the pivot of the whole year.’” The second fault is (roughly speaking) that he has generally placed the first day of

Nisan twenty-four hours too early: we may thus briefly state the practical outcome of the whole argument, as the proper scientific statement would be much longer.

With regard to the second fault, we remark in passing that, whereas Prof. Bacon assumes the point—that Mr. Lewin has placed the first of Nisan too early—as beyond question or discussion, Mr. C. H. Turner (in his admirable article on the “Chronology of the New Testament” in Dr. Hastings’ *Dictionary of the Bible*) comes to the diametrically opposite conclusion, holding that possibly, or even probably, Mr. Lewin places first Nisan too late. This divergence of opinion proves at least that Prof. Bacon is not justified in assuming, as self-evident and certain, that Mr. Lewin errs when he places first Nisan so early. There is reasonable ground for difference of opinion.

We also note that some attention to Mr. Turner’s article and arguments might have been expected in a paper printed eighteen months after that article appeared in the *Dictionary*; but the paper seems to have been delayed.

As to the first of Mr. Lewin’s errors, Prof. Bacon holds that no one “can read . . . Exodus xii. 1–6, and not see that the ‘pivot of the whole calendar’ is, of necessity, not the *full* moon of Nisan, but the *new* moon of Nisan.” We may be confident that Mr. Lewin had read Exodus xii., and knew the facts about the observation of the new moon, on which Prof. Bacon relies. But in truth the point of difference is a mere matter of expression; and the reason why Mr. Lewin chose his own form of expression was that we have first to look for the full moon next after the vernal equinox, and then to take the new moon immediately preceding (*see* p. 363), which gives the first Nisan; from that point of view the Passover full moon is the pivot of the whole year. Mr. Lewin did not mean anything more. If he has not been strictly accurate, it

is a mere verbal detail which does not really affect the question. We defend his general position; but he might differ from some of our views.

The foundation of the second charge lies in the assumption made by Prof. Bacon, that the Jews about A.D. 50-60 possessed no fixed calendar, but arranged their months according to purely empirical observation, beginning a new month only when a new moon had been actually observed and reported by eye-witnesses to the Sanhedrin.

Now what support has he for this assumption? When it is so essential to his purpose, he ought to be very careful both as to its accuracy and as to the convincing character of the arguments in its favour.

As usual with many British and some American writers, the only support which he deems it necessary to bring forward is contained in a quotation from a recent German work (*see* p. 361).

In the first place we observe that the opinion which Prof. Bacon quotes does not prove his assumption. The German professor speaks only of "the time of Jesus Christ"; Prof. Bacon applies the assertion to a year that he fixes as probably A.D. 58. The opinion of the German authority might be right, and yet the inference drawn from it as to the year 58 might be wrong. In what we have to say on this point we shall, therefore, restrict ourselves absolutely to the period 50-60 A.D., and express no opinion as to the facts that ruled during the lifetime of Christ. A change might quite possibly be made in the early years of our era.

1. The period 1-50 A.D. was one of rapid progress and wide-spread change in the arrangement of the calendar. The Julian reform of the calendar had come into force in the beginning of 45 B.C.; and convenience—one might almost say the necessities—of administration soon caused the general adoption in the provinces of the empire of the

principle underlying the new Roman calendar. The time of its adoption in many provinces, and especially in the eastern provinces, was during the reign of Augustus. That was the period when the unification and regulation of the provinces was in progress, and when growing intercourse and trade, as well as administrative convenience, demanded a certain uniformity in the calendar all over the Roman world. We say "a certain uniformity," for most eastern countries partly retained their own customs and names. Thus, *e.g.*, the year widely used in the province Asia began on 24th September;¹ but the months were accommodated in length to the Roman system, so that one could always render a date according to the Roman system into its correspondent according to the Asian system. Similarly in Syria the Macedonian calendar (which was commonly used) was partially assimilated to the Roman. Alongside of the reformed native system, too, the Roman calendar was known and used; and in inscriptions the dates are sometimes given by both systems.

We see, therefore, that change in the calendar was common at this period, and that the Roman calendar must have been familiar in every city of Palestine, Syria, and the East generally.

2. The Jews were now widely spread through the Roman world. They were numerous and often wealthy and influential in the eastern provinces and in Rome itself. Many of them went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem to celebrate the Passover there, so that pilgrim ships were doubtless a

¹ The German authorities on the Asian calendar maintain that this system was universal in the province Asia; but the present writer has brought forward a series of facts pointing to the existence of a Lydo-Phrygian year beginning on 1st August, whose months coincided exactly with the Roman months (*Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, i. p. 204 f., reinforced in *Bulletin de Corresp. Hellén.* 1898, p. 240). This may serve as proof that the curt sentences, in which the Passover reckoning was assumed in *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 289 f., concealed the work and thought of years on the subject of first century chronology.

recognised institution, and regulations for the safety and convenience of the pilgrims were made by the Roman government. But in spite of the number of pilgrims, there must obviously have been very many thousands of Jews in the various provinces who had to stay and celebrate the feast at home. Only a small proportion of them could find money and time to make the long, expensive journey, and abandon their business for weeks and months. The rest kept the Passover in their own homes far from Jerusalem.

Now it stands to reason that they would be desirous to celebrate the feast on the same day, wherever they were. The knowledge that all Israel was performing the same acts at one and the same time was essential to the effect and impressiveness of the ceremony. Without that uniformity it is safe to say that the marvellous unity of the Jewish race could hardly have been maintained. The circumstances of the Jewish Dispersion imperatively demanded a perfect uniformity; and it was the easiest thing possible to secure absolute uniformity.

The Roman calendar was everywhere known. Scientific knowledge was so far advanced that it was practically as easy then as now to get the calculations made beforehand, and fix the first of Nisan for each year, so that it should be known in time throughout the whole Jewish race over all the Roman world. Surely we are not bound to feel so confident that this easy and natural method, with its great advantages, was neglected by the Jews so late as A.D. 58. It was certainly adopted by them afterwards. Mr. Turner holds that they had adopted some pre-arranged system before A.D. 58.¹ So does Mr. Lewin. We believe they are right in this respect, and that Prof. Bacon has gone wrong.

Prof. Bacon assumes as the foundation of his system and his opposition to Mr. Lewin that the Jews were quite careless of uniformity, and followed an empirical procedure

¹ See the quotation given below on p. 436.

which made uniformity practically impossible. According to his view, even as late as the year 58 after Christ, no one knew what was to be the first day of Nisan until "witnesses of the moon" came to Jerusalem, and were examined by the authorities. If they appeared before the authorities by the time of the evening sacrifice, that evening was the "sanctification" of the new moon; but if they appeared a few minutes later, then there was "too little time for the 'sanctification' of the new moon"; and the ceremony had to be postponed. Moreover "a cloudy sky might produce further delay." Thus it was a matter of accident whether first of Nisan began, say, on Tuesday at sunset, or was postponed so as to begin on Wednesday at sunset.¹ Then when the Sanhedrin had fixed the first of Nisan, news could easily be conveyed to all Palestine in good time for every one to have his lamb ready on the tenth.

It seems really hardly credible that any one can seriously imagine that the first of Nisan was unknown in A.D. 58 until this tedious ceremony, with its chances and accidents, was performed. We are not denying that the ceremony may still have been performed as a religious survival: such rites last long. But we do affirm that plain reason makes it certain that the first of Nisan was already fixed long before and known to all Jews in the empire; and that the forms, if preserved, had no practical weight.

In contrast to this idea that the empirical method of determining the first of Nisan was still practised, Mr. Turner holds that "the Jews must before this have modified the method of simple observation by something in the nature of a calendar or cycle, and any such cycle no doubt deviated not infrequently from the results of simple observation."² We unhesitatingly agree with him in this,

¹ We need only advert to the other more serious possibility that in some few cases this would cause a doubt of a whole month.

² Hastings, *Dict.* ii. p. 420 and p. 411.

though we attach less value than he does to the argument by which he goes on to demonstrate that perhaps Mr. Lewin places the first of Nisan too late. We hold that Mr. Lewin's principle is by far the most probable one (though we fully confess the margin of uncertainty that remains in this and in almost all questions¹ of ancient chrenology), viz., that an average of eighteen hours must be allowed between the strict astronomical new moon and the "sanctification." As Prof. Bacon says (p. 362), "according to the rabbis, 27½ hours, at the most, would suffice"; and that gives Mr. Lewin's average very nearly. The reckoning of the good old German scholar Wurm required an average of at least 36 hours; Prof. Bacon takes it as obvious that he must be right; but we hold that Mr. Lewin was fully justified in agreeing with the rabbis and in setting his view aside.

Prof. Bacon himself acknowledges (p. 362) that eye-witnesses of the new moon had never been regarded as absolutely necessary. The old month was not allowed to last longer than the longest term of thirty days, but the new moon was then declared and sanctified, even though it had not actually been seen and reported by any witnesses. That admitted principle, then, needed only to be applied more commonly: the authorities would declare — if we assume that the old ceremony continued in full force—as they had always done, that the new moon had begun, even though circumstances had prevented eye-witnesses from coming forward.

We note in conclusion the curious divergence or result as to the date of the events described in Acts xx. 5 ff. I have argued that 57 is the only reasonably probable date. Prof. Bacon thinks (p. 366 f.) "we are shut up to a choice

¹ This has been stated very clearly and strongly in several places in *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?* and must always be taken for granted, even where desire for brevity leads one to omit any explicit statement as to the uncertainty.

between the date 58 . . . or else the year 55." Mr. Turner holds that probability is against the three years 55, 58, 59, and that 56 and 57 are the only probable alternatives. As already stated, we see little reason for Mr. Turner's argument that "the Alexandrine cycle, which has prevailed in the Christian Church ever since the fourth century," has any claim to be reckoned as evidence of the probable Jewish procedure in the first century.

The uncertainty attaching to ancient chronology generally must be acknowledged to exist here. But the only method is to hold fast to the scientific principle, and to walk along the narrow path between the dangers and uncertainties on either hand as unswervingly and unhesitatingly as the pious Mohammedan does across Al-Sirat, which bridges with its spider-thread breadth the chasm between him and heaven.

In the second place, one cannot but regret that so experienced and able a scholar as Prof. Bacon should admit the principle that, in a case where the issues are so familiar, the deliberate judgment of a good and careful scholar like Mr. Lewin should be pronounced, without qualification or hesitation, an error, simply because the opinion of a German scholar on a review of the same familiar evidence is different from his. The truth is that, with all the learning of the work quoted by Prof. Bacon, its judgment and level-headedness in strictly historical questions are distinctly inferior to Mr. Lewin's; and I would venture to refer him to the criticism of it by Mr. Abrahams published in the *Proceedings of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology* for 1898-99, p. 34. The work is strongly biassed in all that concerns Roman Imperial history by a quite pre-Mommsenian and antiquated prejudice.

W. M. RAMSAY.

RICHARD ROTHE, OF HEIDELBERG:

HIS CENTENARY.

RICHARD ROTHE was born at Posen 28th January, 1799. His centenary was celebrated at Heidelberg in February of *this* year, 1899, and as we are still in the same year, it may be permitted us to join our brethren of Germany in the remembrance of one of the most singular and remarkable of the theological geniuses which that country has produced. He died more than thirty years ago; yet is he considered the most outstanding name in German theology since that of Schleiermacher himself.

The only claim which the present writer has to give this sketch is, that he was himself a student of Rothe's classes in the midsummer of 1858, and therefore had some slight personal knowledge of the German divine.

Let us start with a glimpse of Heidelberg University about the meridian of this century,—very largely attended and then, probably, at the point of its highest reputation. In almost all faculties: in Law, in Letters, in History, but especially in Theology, socially, so far as student life is concerned, it was brilliant, even as a centre of German and European celebrities. It is chiefly, however, from its *theological* importance that we speak of it.

That slight spare man, with the scholarly look, slipping quietly through the streets, is *David Strauss*, now no longer a Professor, but in the leisure evening of his day. This well set up, elderly man, driving his neat pony carriage, with notable bust, expanded chest, and fine head, is *Baron Bunsen*; also pretty much retired from public and ambassadorial life, but still active; and notoriously occupied with his tall assistant (now Professor Kamphausen, of Bonn) in the preparation of his *Bibel-werk*, which was to revive Christian and Bible knowledge in Germany, but has

long since disappeared. The tall, presentable Scottish clergyman whom he is driving, to admire the sights of Heidelberg, is Professor, afterwards President, *James M'Cosh*, of Princeton, U.S.A., then on a visit to Bunsen. If we follow these two out of the University church on Sunday afternoon, we shall hear Dr. McCosh loud in praise of a pulpit oration on the Divine Love, which has just been uttered by *Professor Daniel Schenkel*. The student who writes, has formed his opinion, there and elsewhere, that Dr. Daniel Schenkel is pretty much a windbag—a verdict too pert, perhaps, for the utterer, but not contradicted now, by the verdict of history. If, on a College day, you follow a group of students into a private house and up into the modest drawing-room of the same, the invalided veteran, who reads his lecture to the assembled class from a sofa there, is the gentle *Professor Umbreit*, the author of a commentary, with notes and version of the Book of Job. But the centre point of the University is the class-room of *Professor Richard Rothe*. This unimposing and unpretending theologian looks the most modest of men. When not on duty, he may be seen in the company of his homely spouse, gazing vacantly into shop windows, or sitting pleased to hear an open-air string concert in the grounds of the old castle. When he steals into his crowded class-room, he first turns to hang up his hat on a nail behind the chair, then he flings himself forward on the desk and on his MS., and begins with his usual curt and nasal “*Meine Herren.*” One eye is close down on the paper, the other eye catches a glimpse of the assembled youth, and then retreats towards the ceiling. The upturned eye is by these same playful youth denominated *Faith*, and the other *Reason*—not an inapt suggestion of the singular combination of powers in their possessor. So sharp and penetrating, and incisive on the side of intellect—so soaring and intuitive on the side of Heart and Faith. Indeed,

these two eyes of unequal *focus* are suggestive of something deeply marked in the character of the man, not entirely without parallel in German theological history. *Schleiermacher* before him was one of the most noted instances of the union of Moravian piety with brilliant intellectual gift; a later and less marked example we have, in the generation nearest our own, *Professor Otto Pfleiderer*, of Berlin. Rothe himself insists again and again upon his individual, peculiar and entirely independent standpoint. He is a German of the Germans. His style is eminently his own; and in his greatest work, his *Theologische Ethik*, so *elusive* that we sometimes wonder "if it is *thought*, and not merely words skilfully strung together." But a sketch of his history, especially that of his mind, will put us in a better position for estimating his place in the theological world.

Rothe's father was a Prussian Government official in Posen and Breslau; his mother was a woman of much spiritual gift. In his home religion was a quiet power, not much expressed in words. As a child, he developed a decided direction for the religious, the supernatural and the mystical; quite in contradiction to his surroundings, which were rationalistic. At his confirmation he experienced an awakening. For the supernatural form of the Saviour—his Lord and Redeemer—there arose in him a pious devotion, the exercise of which afforded him the most intense enjoyment. Along with this there sprang up in his mind an enthusiastic love of literature. Goethe, Schiller, Jean Paul, both the Schlegels, Tieck, but especially Novalis, were his favourites. The romantic spirit of the time made a deep impression upon him. In his childhood came the great year of patriotic uprising against the power of Napoleon. And Breslau was a centre of the movement. The Court resided here three months of the year 1813. Here were assembled such men as Von Stein and Moritz

Arndt, and hundreds of volunteers crowded to their banner. In 1817 Rothe completed his school course and entered the University—with the permission rather than encouragement of his parents—to study theology. Heidelberg was the University of his choice. He was warned from the first against its prevailing spirit, which in those days was regarded as mystical and overstrained, yet with undoubted speculative and poetic impulses. Daub, a now forgotten speculative theologian, and Hegel, the great philosopher, were its leading lights, as well as the historical researcher, Schlosser. Into this atmosphere plunged young Rothe with great joy and keenness. For Hegel he had at first little taste and hardly any understanding, but his logic and metaphysic began to interest him. The student life of the time, however, was pre-eminently attractive. These were the days of supreme patriotic feeling among students, and saw the founding of the well-known *Burschenschaften*. Into these Rothe threw himself upon conscientious principle, rather than from any personal pleasure they gave him. The public life of the time appeared to the young student as the beginning of a regeneration. It was marked by the festival of the *Burschenschaften*, which was held on the 18th October, 1817, at the Wartburg. Amid all this, his piety was protected by the childlikeness and simplicity of his life. He never forgot to attend church; every night before retiring to rest he sang a hymn. His relation to his parents remained childlike as ever, while we perceive a rapid growth of his personality, an increasing firmness of judgment, and a more determined cast of character.

Now as his twenty-first year approaches, we perceive the crisis which so often comes to spirits like his, exactly at that age. With Luther it led to the cloister and the struggles of the monk, and at last full emancipation. In men like Rothe it oft begins as disillusionment. His childlike optimism suddenly changed to an almost choleric pessimism. His

joyous contentment with existence broke into a bitter criticism. His third Heidelberg semester marks the period. Openly it took the form of Discontentment—a double sort: discontentment with the world as it appeared to him, and discontentment with his own spiritual possessions, the incompleteness of which could not yet possibly satisfy him. Several outward events intensified this strife: the breakdown of the student movement for freedom in 1819 by the rash act of young Sand in the assault upon the life of Kotzebue, and the not unnatural public reaction which followed it. Still deeper went this disturbance in regard to Church matters. It may be said that now Rothe begins to doubt as to the future of his own Protestant Church. He had long been inclined to hold that Protestantism was only a stage in the attainment of a higher Catholicism. But now arose the question in his mind, If Protestantism generally was anything positive, if one can really speak of a Protestant Church, if what is so called be not a mere negation of the idea, if the only true Church were not the Catholic Church! And at this point we see Rothe already on the way to Rome; really, however, only in his thought. His entire religious feeling remains Protestant. We perceive only the baffled striving of a young thinker ensnared in his own dogmatism, who makes the attempt to reconcile everything with his own dogmatic conception, and falls out with the spiritual world which surrounds him and with his own perception of it. He is, in short, dissatisfied with his whole surroundings. He is wholly dis severed from the social life of his student days, and at his departure from Heidelberg sings a Thanksgiving Psalm for his deliverance.

In the autumn of 1819 he left Heidelberg to continue his studies in Berlin. There he came within the influence of men like Schleiermacher, Neander, Marheinecke, and again Hegel. But the spirit of incompleteness and of discontent still possessed him. Even these great men had little sway

with him. He was a man of such peculiar individuality that he must fight his own battle alone and reconcile the two conflicting forces of his own nature ; his keen desire for thorough knowledge and understanding on the one side, his deep-hearted conception of the spiritual and supernatural on the other. One perceives in him the traces of this strife all through his life and work. No one could have a more entire, honest, and thorough-going hold of Christ as his supernatural Redeemer, of the now exalted and glorified Christ as the Ruler of the world, of the Crucified Christ as its Saviour. But no one could curb for a moment the freedom of his intellectual criticism or blunt the keenness of his perception of all the facts both of the theological and of the actual world.

On the close of his studies in Berlin, Rothe entered himself, at the advice of Neander, on seminary life in Wittenberg. The Theological Seminary is what we would call the *Divinity School proper* of the German pastor, however much he may have studied theology speculatively at the University. The personalities of the Seminary School had new attractions for him—the general superintendent, Nitsch, father of the well-known theologian, Karl Immanuel Nitsch, the Provost Schleusner, especially the strongly orthodox and believing Heubner, afterwards his brother-in-law, a man of noble metal, of great fulness of ideas, and of sharp perception. For a long while the inward contest still went on. The reconciliation between his deeply ingrained pietistic devoutness and his ever-rising delight in life went very slowly on. There was ever that real fight with himself, a love too for his Redeemer, a burning heart for mankind, a deep hate of sin, a painful despising of human nature, together with a glowing enthusiasm for its high worth. “O thou despised world,” he cries, “that most of us only knew, how much we have in thee!” “The spiritual man is like all others. He belongs also to the

world, and only through experience of life learns that all the relations of earth are holy so soon as one brings to them a holy disposition. So have I seen that noble Christlike men bring forth fruit."

In his second semester (1821) all this came to a head. There broke upon the seminary the storm of a new spirit. The entering candidates were mostly of the "awakened," with a newly awakened zeal. The most important personality of this time was *Rudolph Stier*, afterwards superintendent of Schkeuditz, near Leipsic, and the well-known author of the Evangelical commentary on *The Words of the Lord Jesus*. No other man ever made so deep an impression upon Rothe, and he retained it to the last day of his life. Stier was a Christian of the old stamp, a noble mixture of the thorough scriptural belief of the 16th century, with the deep inward piety of Spencer and Franke. Not long after this came his engagement to Luise von Brück, a sister-in-law of his friend Heubner. In the whole transaction he was a thorough-going pietist. "I put the matter wholly into the Lord's hand," he said, and in the last hour of prayer his conviction stood fast.

Late in the year 1822 he left the seminary and returned to his home in Breslau. The inward struggle still, to some extent, continued. "I was an upright, a sincere pietist, but not a happy one; a pietist of the conscience, but without real joyfulness." Preaching and study went on with great diligence till a notable event occurred which gave an entirely new turn both to his outward and to his inward life. In 1823 a call reached him to become *chaplain to the embassy at Rome*. The attraction was very obvious for a man of such academic culture, united to great preaching gifts and delight in preaching. But it cost him much inward conflict to make up his mind. Sleepless nights were spent in meditation and prayer before he came to a decision.

In the beginning of 1824 Rothe and his young wife arrived in Rome. The change was for him a striking one : from the Wittenberg Seminary to the capital of the world, from an exclusive intercourse with theological students and professors to a world-wide international fellowship with princes and noblemen, diplomatists and artists of the most various national, literary, religious, and artistic education and spiritual interests ; from the motherland of Protestantism to the centre point of the Roman Catholic Church ; from a narrow pietistic conventicle to a wide-opened world where culture and educated sensibility reigned and gathered together educated men out of all countries. But his own relation to all this was exactly what might have been expected. "Rome," he says, "has no other interest for me than the first village would have had to which I had been appointed pastor." The Vatican and the Colosseum alone might possibly have awakened some astonishment. But beyond his home happiness, which in the highest degree contented him, it was simply and solely the interest of the office he had undertaken which absorbed him. His preaching gifts were addressed to no indifferent circle. Three evangelical ambassadors belonged to his congregation : Baron Bunsen represented Prussia, Baron von Reden Hanover, and Reinhold the Netherlands, distinguished painters, sculptors and architects, people of rank and wealth from all lands, who flocked thither for pleasure, learned men who had a scientific purpose, sick people in search of health, German artisans and workmen who had strayed thither. A lively religious interest at that time pervaded the artistic world. Rome was the centre of a movement among distinguished men of artistic circles, the aim of which was the reconciling of religion and art.

Our own Scottish Thomas Erskine, of Linlathen, is expressly mentioned by Rothe as one of those with whom it

was his peculiar delight to have religious intercourse. The direction of his work at this time may be gathered from his own words: "The Bible was to me a complete organism, a mirror of our common life, out of which everything is to be gained which is necessary for knowledge. The essential elements of speculation are to be found in the Holy Scripture. It is a microcosm. The new life which has come to us through Christ has all those varied sides which our own spirit has. It is really a life, not only of moral sanctification, but also in the acknowledgment of truth, and in the presentation of beauty. All mirrors itself in the Scripture, not as abstract presentation of new knowledge, but as a living image of real life."

It is evident also all the while that he is working at the solution of his own personal problem. "According to my small experience there is nothing so wholesome as practically and livingly to learn the pure *moral* nature of faith; that a man can with truth joyfully say to his Saviour, 'Lord, I seek Thee and not myself. I know nothing in myself of which I can have any joy, over which I must not bitterly lament; I know nothing in heaven or on earth through which I can have help but from Thee alone.' Upon this rests the real certainty, validity, and strength of faith." Of his preaching it can be said that it flows out of his innermost personal life; he preaches because his heart is full of it. Dogmatically it is still upon the basis of the orthodox, but it is the inner life which commands it, for the dogmatic background is unthought of. Towards the close of his Roman sojourn we read that "Italian scenery is made for the artist, but has not much effect upon the soul." The life of the people has no charm for him; the carnival affects him in a very different way from that in which (*e.g.*) it affected Goethe; the Catholic festivals are to him tasteless and spiritless. Roman Catholicism finds nothing in him to content. "If any one wants to be thoroughly convinced

that the Romish Church has no help or reviving for the Church of Christ, let him come to Rome."

By this time his pursuits and studies had turned him to the scientific side of Christianity rather than to the homiletic, and an offer being made to him of a place in the professorship of the Wittenberg Seminary, he left Rome in June, 1828, and returned to Wittenberg in September. The chief fruit of his *nine* years' literary and theological activity there was the appearance in 1837 of *The Beginnings of the Christian Church and her Constitution : a Historical Essay*. For the reconciliation of his inward life the time at Wittenberg was the continuance and completion of the time at Rome. It brought to him a full inward freedom. One can read now more completely his favourite solution of life problems, the entire outline of his view of the world, and that which remained with him for the rest of his days. It was in substance this :

A conviction of the unity of the Divine and of the truly human—the unity of Christendom with that of real humanity. The natural powers which God has planted in man are the powers through which God is building up His kingdom. The departments of ordinary human life, calling and family, social and public life, art and science, these are the departments in which the Divine life works itself out. The historical development of mankind is nothing less than the life of God slowly actualizing itself through the powers of men. But Rothe brought these Hegelian ideas to a more exact point. He has put the question and given the answer. Has this natural human life, which is also the life of God, in the world any combination in settled order? As the Church is the community of the religious life, is there any community for the human life? He finds this community in the State. Church and State are the two organisms, of which the latter is by no means secondary to the former in independent worth before God. This con-

ception was, of course, an entire overturning of the simple and one-sided religious standpoint. It meant an entire and radical opposition to the pietistic view of the world, which recognises certain cherished conditions of the heart as the only realities in the sight of God, and treats the world which lies beyond these with indifference, or even with hostility. He has arrived at the conviction that it had been a fault of the pietistic movement to repress individuality; and that in the fullest development of his individual powers lies the life-task of every human being. That to watch the unfolding of human history was worthy of an almost devout attention, for behind these occurrences lay deep designs of Providence, that the movements of public life corresponded to a great Divine plan for the human race.

Up to this time he had been indifferent to politics; in Rome he had hardly ever read a newspaper. Political history had taken for him, since the July Revolution of 1830, a meaning and a charm. But what has the Reformation and Protestantism to do with the great evolution of mankind? For this question also he has his answer. The Church is not the final aim. The final aim is the State—the organization of the moral life, and Protestantism has no higher task than gradually to lead men out of the exclusively religious region into the moral. What have we from the Reformation? Not unbelief. The Reformation required science; at God's design she has called it into life; unbelief is only a passing phenomenon, not the destruction of piety. The pious Christian is no more than the true and real man. The Reformation has really brought piety back into human life. She has created a Church, though this is not of the greatest importance. The Reformation has created a greater fellowship than that of a narrow, external Church. Far from restricting Christian fellowship within the narrow limits of a Church, she has opened it to

the world. Not a new Church, but the world itself, the entire common life of mankind shall form the region of the Christian fellowship. No more shall there be a particular Christian society, but all human society shall become Christian.

The scene of Rothe's activity during the remaining thirty years of his life was the Chair of Theology in *Heidelberg*, to which he was translated in 1837. With the exception of five or six years in a similar position at Bonn, his vigour as a scholar and as a man was devoted to the fulfilment of this task. During his first ten years of professorial life at Heidelberg the main product was the publication of his *Theologische Ethik* (1845), in which were embodied the ideas we have briefly sketched, and which was undoubtedly his most characteristic contribution to theological literature. The other main work published in his lifetime was his *Zur Dogmatik*, "Introduction to Dogmatics," in which he discusses from his own standpoint the idea of Dogmatic, the nature of Revelation, and the Holy Scripture. His own class-treatment of *Dogmatic* was not published till after his death. It is a valuable outline of all the usual Christian doctrines, accompanied with a threefold criticism: a comparison of it with the Biblical statement,—a scientific criticism, and one from the standpoint of religious feeling. Revelation completes itself through a manifestation of God in historical and natural occurrences which bear a miraculous character; and, on the other hand, through inspiration, which acts on the human mind, not magically, but morally. Rothe does not allow that Revelation and Holy Scripture are identical. Scripture is the necessary historical annal or account of Revelation. But the Bible does not contain the entire truth; there follows after it always new and further Christian truth. The result of Biblical research must contribute its part, the repression or concealment of which will only stir up doubt and mistrust. These ideas of Rothe

were not new, but the manner in which they were expressed, from a believing standpoint, made a great impression on the theological world.

Another of his favourite ideas anticipated, and may be said to have originated, one that has become prominent and characteristic of the Ritschlian school. We are possessed, he said, of the conviction that the Christendom of our day can only believe with inward truth in an undogmatic Christ. The Christ of the theologians can never, for Christians in general, become an object of belief. The large proportion of hearts beats cordially for the undogmatic Christ of the New Testament, even when they have turned from the Christ of the theologians. To help these *unconscious* Christians—to help them to the consciousness that the best they have springs from Christ, that must be held the chief task of our time. “Let us suppose,” he said, “that the Lord Jesus were again to appear in the midst of Christendom, but exactly as of old, in the form of a servant, in the most complete *incognito*, without title, and without credentials, without his robes of office, and without the insignia of His heavenly Father, so that there were nothing to be seen in Him by us but His holiness, His heart wholly filled by His heavenly Father with pitying love and enlightening truth. Who of our present Christians would hold to Him and recognise Him, and who not? I judge no man beforehand, but, for my part, I hold that many of those who with the greatest readiness would subscribe an orthodox confession about Christ, would pass Him by without recognition, without at all suspecting His Divine origin, just because they did not perceive in Him those decisive signs which stand in their dogmatic. And that, on the other hand, many of those who are not able to make their own the Church Confession about Christ would feel drawn to Him in the deepest ground of their hearts, would follow Him in every step, and would fall adoring at His feet.”

“And so,” he says, addressing one in whom this struggle between faith and unbelief was at its height—“so you will perceive that what you call unbelief is to a great extent not such; that, indeed, the real unbelief in Jesus has its seat in quite other regions than where you seek it. You will become aware of a real and already present faith in Jesus which you have not hitherto acknowledged, because a false representation of Him has blinded your eye. You will become conscious of your hitherto *unconscious* Christianity, you will call by its right name what of true piety lives in you, namely, faith in our Lord Jesus Christ,—no more, as heretofore, a love of virtue and the like; you will humbly give thanks for all that is good and noble in you to Jesus, from whom alone it springs. You will joyfully acknowledge Him before all the world, and reach, without shyness, the brother hand to those who have long since openly confessed Him.”¹

One can see how this amiable, but really practically unworkable position of Rothe's latest years led to what was a *tragic* result, so far as he personally was concerned—a tragedy not of the outward or sensational kind, but one of the soul and heart in a man so sensitive. The curious disparity and inconsistency between his far-reaching intellectual positions, his determination to secure absolute liberty of teaching within the Church, and his firm personal adherence to the spiritual and supernatural elements in Christianity, his firm belief in the supernatural and glorified Divine Christ of the Scriptures, are obvious enough. In his latest years he took an open and public place in ecclesiastical and even in political affairs, such as he had never previously occupied. Along with Schenkel, who was really the active and working member of the alliance, he founded the well-known *Protestanten-Verein*—“*Protestant Union*,”

¹ *Gesammelte Vorträge und Abhandlungen Dr. Richard Rothes aus seinen letzten Lebensjahren.* Elberfeld: R. L. Friederichs, 1886.

which gave a practical expression to principles that have been sketched.

This movement was put into definite shape at Frankfort (a.-M.) on September 20th, 1863. At first the movement had great vogue. A good deal of enthusiasm and unity were evoked. The intention, rather vaguely expressed, it must be admitted, was the formation of a Church which would include all that had been gained in the Christian culture which had prevailed in Europe since the beginning of the present century. A Church which is to be the Church of the people must create an inward agreement with the life of the people, with their entire culture,—must come into sympathetic and happy mutual connection with them. “Things are come to that point, that our Church must with full consciousness express her choice between the alternative of being a people’s Church or a mere meeting for pietistic edification.” These ideas gained ground at the first celebration of the Protestant Union, 7th June, 1865, and again at a celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Preachers’ Seminary, founded by Rothe. But in the midst of these hopeful developments of the new era there occurred suddenly a great disturbance. This was occasioned by the appearance in 1864 of Schenkel’s *Characterbild Jesu* following Renan’s *Leben Jesu*. The consequence of the appearance of this book was a violent agitation against the author, and a desire for his removal from the directorship of the Seminary. It gave occasion to the protest of 118 of the ministers of Baden, and was followed by a decision of the rulers of the Church in the same direction. The publication of a representation of Christ without the supernatural birth and the bodily resurrection, without the miraculous feedings and without the raisings of the dead, was a sufficient ground for all this. The storm evoked fell as much upon Rothe as upon Schenkel, though in the case of the former certainly quite unjustifiably. But the blow

given to the movement was in Rothe's case fatal. It was followed by public decisions of the Church authorities which could not be revoked. Rothe took it seriously to heart, and in the end sickened and died, 20th August, 1867. During his illness, being asked if he wished his relatives to be called, he declined, with the peculiar remark, "It is not good when so many people stand round a death-bed. There is no room left for the angels of God." One of his last utterances was: "I die in the faith upon which I have lived, and this faith is for me in nothing disturbed or gone astray. It has only always become more inward and more steadfast." His funeral services were attended by great numbers, and he was interred with the greatest honours.¹

JOHN LAIDLAW.

¹ The latter part of this paper is greatly indebted to the tractate, *Richard Rothe, sein Character, Leben und Denken*. Von Wilhelm Hönig Pfarrer in Heidelberg. Berlin, 1898.

APOCALYPTIC SKETCHES.

XI.

THE CITY OF GOD.

REV. XXI.

THE two chapters which remain are very simple compared with those through which we have been struggling, yet even these are not quite so simple as they seem. To the ordinary reader they stand unmistakably for a description of the heavenly state; but though this interpretation seems to fit the greater part, it cannot be maintained throughout. "They shall bring the glory and the honour of the nations into it" (v. 26). What nations? Have we not seen the great white throne and witnessed the final judgment? How then can there still be nations outside the city of God? And since there is no more death or pain or curse, how comes it that these nations need healing? For we read (xxii. 2), "The leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations." Will there be nations in heaven that have need of healing?

So seriously has this difficulty been felt that many have given up altogether the reference to the heavenly state, and apply the passage exclusively to the present, understanding it simply as another way of putting the ideal of the Church on earth. The Church now and always should be the Bride of God, the holy city, into which nothing enters that defileth, so glorious and beautiful that all will recognise her excellence, with the result that the kings of the earth will bring their glory into it, and the glory and honour of all nations shall be attracted to it; and, on the other hand, healing influences should go forth from her to all nations, so that there should be no more curse.

If, however, we drop the reference to the heavenly state, we find ourselves in difficulty with other parts of the

description, which seem so clearly and unmistakably to carry us forward to an entirely new state of things. It is not like the description of the saints risen in spirit and reigning with Christ in the preceding chapter, for there the language was no stronger than is found in other parts of the book, and in other books of the Bible, as descriptive of the ideal state of the Church on earth. But it is different here, as, *e.g.*, where we read: "Death shall be no more; neither shall there be mourning, nor crying, nor pain, any more; the first things are passed away." And again, "There shall be no night there." And again, perhaps most decisive of all, "I saw no temple therein," for surely it can scarcely be said that before the Church can reach her ideal on earth she must destroy all her sacred edifices. If we must accept some reference to the Church in its present state, we may not regard the meaning as exhausted by it; we must leave room for the time-honoured interpretation which has commended itself to the Christian conscience in all ages.

There seems, indeed, to be no great difficulty in combining the two applications, for the one passes into the other by a natural and almost inevitable process of thought. The ideal of the present is to be the reality of the future. "The Holy to the Holiest leads." The Church on earth has the foretaste here, the full banquet there. There is a sense in which even here all things are new to the Christian: "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creation; old things are passed away; behold, all things are made new." There clearly, however, the great change is in the man, so that he sees the things around him in a new light. But in the passage before us the change is not in the people only, but in the surroundings. There is a sense in which the believer in Christ even here is already victor over pain and death, as well as over sin; but it does not fill up the measure of the language used in

this passage. Here we see these things dwindling; there we see them gone. Yet the two conditions are so closely related that they can be seen in the same line of vision; the near horizon of the Ideal, and beyond it the far horizon of the coming Real. As "the law had a shadow of good things to come, not the very image of the things," so that in the shadow of the law could be seen a picture of the good things of the gospel, so is it in the gospel as related to the great consummation of the heavenly glory. It seems, therefore, not at all unnatural to suppose that the apostle had both the present and the future in his mind, both the ideal and the real, and that this sufficiently accounts for the fact that parts of the description are applicable to the present, while for the most part it is a vision of the great future, when

All we have willed, or hoped, or dreamed of good, shall exist,
Not its semblance, but itself . . .
When eternity affirms the conception of an hour.

Let us bear in mind, then, as we read this passage, that we should use it in both ways. Let us not relegate it to the future in such wise that we miss its value as setting forth a high ideal for the present towards which we must ever aim. The cities in which we live will never, in these days of ours, attain to the perfection of the New Jerusalem as here described; but that is no reason at all why we should not work towards it, no reason why the citizens of our great cities should set before them any lower aim than that of making them as like as possible to the city of God. And it will encourage us all the more to work for this, if we remember that it will not always be an ideal to which we are painfully and often well-nigh hopelessly reaching up, but a state of things which will certainly be realized in the fulness of the times.

Now let us look at the passage itself.

First, we must bear in mind the connection with that which immediately precedes and in particular with the new book which has just been opened, called "The Lamb's Book of Life." At the close of St. John's Gospel we read, "These are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye may have life in His name." And the Apocalypse, like the Gospel, converges on the comprehensive blessing of Life, life in its large, liberal sense, set free from all that hinders and annoys, and with capacities and powers perfected for noblest use. Now the new life must have a new environment. The new wine cannot be put into the old bottles. No one can say that this is the best of all possible worlds in the abstract. It is quite conceivable, however, that it may be the best of all possible worlds for the life that is in it now, with which its mingled darkness and light, sunshine and shade, rose and thorn, calm and tempest, are in obvious harmony. But when life shall have been emancipated and glorified, then the old environment will serve no longer; there must be a new one.

"And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth are passed away; and the sea is no more." We must be careful not to import our modern astronomy into the text. When we speak of the heavens now, we generally mean the starry vault with its infinity of space, and its galaxies of suns and systems. But here surely the word is used in the familiar Hebrew sense, signifying the upper air as distinguished from the under earth; as when in the first chapter of Genesis we read of the fowl that "fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven." The change in view, therefore, does not necessarily involve the solar system, far less the great universe, but only the earth itself with its surrounding atmosphere.

Moreover, we must remember that the word in the

original translated "new" does not necessarily imply a new creation; rather does it suggest the thought of renovation. The essential constituents of the atmosphere may be the same, so that the students of Argon, and Krypton, and Neon, and Metargon, may not have to destroy their old note books, but may build on the old foundation other newer and more marvellous discoveries; only we may be sure that it will not be laden with soot, or infested with death-dealing microbes, or so darkened with fog as to dull the golden streets.

"And the sea is no more." Again, we must remember that this is no geography lesson. In the first place, we must not allow ourselves to forget that we are dealing with a vision, the landscape of which is necessarily limited by the range of the eye. The seer was a prisoner on a lonely island, too small for any river scenery. His daily outlook had been upon the "salt, unplumbed, estranging sea." Now that he is "in the spirit" the scene is completely changed. All is new; and instead of the weary sea there is a beautiful river, flowing through loveliest scenery, to make glad the city of God. Where are the wild waves, and what has become of their monotonous dirge? Gone. "The sea is no more." But the fact that the scene on which the eye of the seer rests has not even an arm of the sea in any part of it surely does not settle for all space and time the entire physiography of the better land. Moreover, we are dealing, not with plain prose, but with high poetry. Therefore we must understand the absence from the vision of the sea, not as suggesting the annihilation of the mighty ocean, to the majesty of which no one who admires the works of God would wish to bid eternal farewell, but the absence of all that the sea stood for to the Patmos prisoner—loneliness, restless tossing to and fro, estrangement, exile, melancholy, and mysterious dread.

A new heaven and a new earth, with no moaning of the

homeless sea, such is the place the Bridegroom has prepared. And now the Bride enters. The last we saw of her was when the heavens were opened to disclose the preparations for the marriage feast (xix. 8). Now the marriage has taken place, for she is in this chapter (v. 9) spoken of as "the bride, the wife of the Lamb." And as the marriage ceremony was in heaven, we now see her coming down from heaven to take possession of her home: "And I saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, made ready as a bride adorned for her husband."

So the bride is a city, a community. This is the familiar scriptural idea. "Thy Maker is thine Husband" was said, not to an individual, but to a nation. And so it will be found even in those passages which seem most to suggest a more personal application, as *e.g.* that saying of St. Paul's, "I espoused you to one husband that I might present you as a pure virgin to Christ," the application being to the Church to which he is writing. It was indeed a woman whom John saw in the former vision arrayed in fine linen white and pure, but the woman was the symbol of the Church, of the redeemed and sanctified community of saints, here presented to view as the city of God.

From this, again, it follows that we are not to think of the city as the place in which the redeemed shall dwell, but as the symbol of the people themselves. It is not the house; but the bride who dwells in the house. The house we have had already: the new heavens and new earth, made fit to be the abode of the pure and holy community.

But may we not at all events consider this much settled as to place—that heaven is to be, not in some far-off world, but on this very earth on which we live made new? . This may be, and it is in many ways an interesting and a pleasant thought; but this chapter does not settle it, for the reason already insisted on, that this is not a geography or

astronomy lesson, but a vision ; and the new heavens and the new earth which John saw were not the reality but only the picture, a picture in lines and colours within the range of his understanding ; and of course the reality may be as much greater than that which John saw as a country-side is greater than the painted canvas which represents it to the eye.

With the vision comes a voice, a great voice out of the Throne, with the assurance that Bride and Bridegroom are united for ever in the new home. Attention has till now been fixed on the Bride entering her place ; but the voice calls attention to the abiding presence of the Divine Bridegroom, with the result that all sadness and sighing have fled away for evermore. "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He shall dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God : and He shall wipe away every tear from their eyes ; and death shall be no more ; neither shall there be mourning, nor crying, nor pain any more : the first things are passed away." Thus is realized at last the full significance of the old revelation of God in the Tabernacle. What an interesting study, were there time, to follow its development first into the temple of Solomon, then into the second temple, and later still the magnificent erection of Herod ; then its elevation into the Temple of the New Testament, the incarnate Christ, who spoke of "the Temple of His body," the Word made flesh, and coming to tabernacle among men, as St. John puts it in his Gospel, as "Emmanuel, God with us," when only the few beheld His glory, when the light shone in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not ; and then on and up to this final realization of the Divine thought and promise, when the light no longer shines in darkness, for darkness is no more ; when He comes to His own, not to be despised and rejected, but to be welcomed and delighted in, not to have His gift

of life refused, but to see it all around in fulness of strength and joy for evermore.

The words which follow (*vv.* 5-8) may be taken, not as part of the description, but as a solemn word from the Throne, of encouragement, and promise, and warning. This is one of those parts which is clearly addressed to men upon the earth as it is now. The verses need no exposition, but it may be well to note in passing that evidently the new creation is to be as easily accomplished as the old. Then, "He spake and it was done; He commanded and it stood fast." So now: "Behold, I make all things new. And He said unto me, It is done." How different from the long agony of redemption! How easy to make a world! How terribly hard to redeem a soul from sin and death! Ages of agony to make man new! only a word to make all things new! The new *life* comes as the gift of God through the humiliation of the manger, the agony of the garden, the shame of the Cross, the gloom of the grave, the struggle of the ages; the new *environment* comes with a wave of the hand.

From the ninth verse onwards we have another vision of the Holy City as from a high mountain to which the seer has been conducted in spirit by one of the angels of the vials. It is full of detail on which we cannot enter without departing from the plan of these Apocalyptic Sketches, and perhaps it is as well for the reader that the plan on which we are working forbids the attempt to expound in detail; for it is hazardous to do more than touch such a passage as this, where exposition is so apt to take the form of translating out of splendid poetry into very poor prose. Far better leave the glorious imagery to make its own impression on the reverent mind. I shall content myself, therefore, with a few general remarks on the whole description.

It is evidently founded on Ezekiel's vision of the city of God in his closing chapters; but it differs from it in some

most significant respects, which it is well worth while to notice. In the first place, while Ezekiel's is a plan of the actual city, capable of being followed like an architect's plan and specifications, St. John's is purely ideal. Look at the dimensions: 12,000 furlongs. By measurement that is as near as may be our 1,500 miles; and I fancy that even those who are most eager to make 1,000 years mean exactly a millennium of time will scarcely insist on the 12,000 furlongs as the precise measurement of the city of God, the more especially as it applies not only to the length and the breadth, but to the height. The city is 12,000 furlongs high. Fifteen hundred miles straight up in the air—what kind of a city is that? The answer is plain. It is the idea of the cube of the Holy of Holies in the old Tabernacle enlarged and glorified. The 12 is the mystic number of the patriarchs of the Old Testament and the apostles of the New, and it is made 12,000 to give a general idea of vastness, while the cubical form, the length and breadth and height all equal, gives the idea of perfection. It is clear then that the city is purely ideal. The figures do not mean dimensions; they mean ideas.

Another significant difference from the city of Ezekiel is found in the striking declaration: "I saw no temple therein." The temple was the great feature of Ezekiel's vision. There are whole chapters about it with the most elaborate details; and the division between sacred and secular is most carefully observed. Here the division between secular and sacred is obliterated quite, not however by levelling down, but by levelling up, not, as so often happens in this sinful world, by making all secular, but by making all sacred. "I saw no temple therein; for the Lord God, the Almighty, and the Lamb are the Temple thereof," and there is no spot or corner of the city where He is not. The city has no temple, because it is all Temple. It is the perfect cube filled with the Shekinah. It is the Holy of Holies expanded

into a world. And just as the Holy of Holies in the Tabernacle had no window to let in the sun, and no candlestick like that which was needed to illuminate the Holy Place which led to it, but was lighted by the Shekinah alone, so the "city hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon to shine upon it; for the glory of God doth lighten it, and the lamp thereof is the Lamb.

The next great difference follows upon the absence of the Temple. It is in the river of the vision. Ezekiel's came forth from the temple; here there is no temple from which the river might proceed, so it flows direct from the Throne of God and of the Lamb, which, by the way, reminds us of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as set forth in St. John's Gospel as proceeding from the Father and the Son. Lastly, while the vision as a whole is expressed, as far as circumstances will allow, in terms of Ezekiel's prophecy, at the close it runs back to a much older record and takes for its imagery the old-world picture of the Garden of Eden; but as that takes us into the last chapter, it must be separately considered.

XII.

THE PARADISE OF GOD.

REV. XXII.

In the above article attention has been called to the relation of this vision of the city of God to that of Ezekiel in the closing chapters of his prophecy. Here, as there, the last feature is the River of Life, in the older prophecy proceeding out of the temple, in the later prophecy, where there is no temple, "proceeding out of the Throne of God and of the Lamb." The symbol of the river gains fresh significance here by contrast with the sea, which is no more.

The sea is solitary; the river is eminently social, its

banks the scene where men especially do gather, and build their busy cities. "The troubled sea which cannot rest" is an emblem of the wicked, but restful progress is suggested by the onward flowing stream. While the sad sea waves speak of melancholy and mystery, the river has a tone of gladness, from the babbling brook of merry childhood to the calm, peaceful flow of serene old age. You can drink of the fresh river but not of the salt sea; you can wash in the soft water of the stream as you cannot in the hard brine of the ocean; and while the margin of the one is barren sand, where nothing lives, the bank of the other is living green, where everything grows in luxuriance watered by the crystal stream. Even to a Western mind the symbol is most expressive; but how much more so to one familiar from his infancy with the scorching heat of a Syrian summer, and now condemned to exile and a barren shore! To him a stream of clear crystal water meant not only the chief necessity, but the highest luxury of life, while at the same time it recalled the old home to which his thoughts were ever fondly turning.

Up to this point in the vision the seer, rapt in contemplation of the new city, has been using as the materials for its construction the vision of Ezekiel; but the mention of the river sends him back to Eden, and suggests to his mind that while the joy of the new Jerusalem is in the main the joy of city life, it is not on that account deprived of the rapture which the pure soul finds in the beauty and calm of nature. The New Jerusalem is also to be a new Paradise, and none the less a Paradise that it is a populous city. As a rule, in these days of ours, people who go into cities leave Paradise behind them. They may try to keep the name, as in Marylebone's Lisson Grove, which can boast of its Paradise Street; but what a mockery! and what a reproach to the nineteenth century! Such a grove, such a paradise is that which man, apart from God, makes

for himself in this age of progress and high civilization. It was indeed a distinct advance when men gave up the nomadic life and built them cities; but, alas, that they should so often sink into slums! Is it necessary?

Certainly not, if this vision be a true one. The city of God will have none of them. Not that city life is bad and must be abandoned for a general return to Arcadian simplicity. We are to retain all the advantages—the convenience, the culture, the stimulus, the fellowship, the enjoyment—which the city at its best stands for; but all the amenities of the country are to be conjoined with it. The New Jerusalem is also to be a new Paradise: “On this side of the river and on that was the tree of life, bearing twelve manner of fruits, yielding its fruit every month.” The imagery is the simplest; but it is most suggestive both in what we miss and in what we find. There is no tree of the knowledge of evil, no forbidden fruit, no serpent to beguile. Sin has been conquered, and temptation has gone for ever. There are no danger signals, no trespass notices. Every one can do just as he pleases, for the simple reason that nothing now will please him that can displease his Father or do harm to his neighbour or himself. Every tree now is a tree of life. There is no restriction, and there is the richest variety. The old Eden has its one tree of life with one kind of fruit; now there are trees of life all along the river banks with fruit in liberal profusion, as indicated by the mystic number twelve, and, further, by the monthly crops. For there is no winter in this year, yet no monotony of an unchanging season, for there are twelve seasons now in every year, each bearing fruit, and each its own fruit. So richly and happily suggestive is the simple imagery of the new Paradise.

“And the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations,” which reminds us that we must not relegate this vision of hope wholly to the future. We have seen reason

in previous references to believe that the seer thought not only of the ultimate reality but of the present ideal; that, as the ideal of the present and the real of the future lay in the same line of vision, he could think now of the one and now of the other without altering his position. Be it remembered then that even here on earth there is for the Christian a "Paradise Regained." Even here the tree of life is growing. The time of fruit is not yet; it is the time of leaves, but even the leaves have their value, "the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations."

Let us not think of the present time as the winter. It is not summer yet; but it is springtime; therefore let us expect to see life springing up around us. Let us look for healing to the nations from the tree of life, not to individuals only, saved out of the general wreck of humanity, but to communities, to the nations, to our cities and towns. Let us have our rivers pure, our streets clean, our spaces wide, our avenues bordered with trees. And, what is far more important, let us put away all that defileth, all that worketh abomination or that maketh a lie. But how many hindrances, how much discouragement in the work of reform! There, in that Apocalyptic vision, is the high ideal, but how can we ever hope to reach it, or even to come within sight of it? Certainly not till men look up for it; not till they seek and find the inspiration of heavenly love which will unite men in a true brotherhood; not till men learn to love one another even as Christ loved us all and gave Himself for us all, that He might unite us to one another as brethren, and all to Himself as a holy Bride. The path of this Apocalypse is the only path to the Paradise city of God. The New Jerusalem cannot be built up from below. It must come down out of heaven from God.

Before we allow ourselves to swing back, as naturally we shall immediately, from the ideal of the present to the great prospect of the future, let us notice that what follows has

also its application to the present as well as to the future, for surely to the Christian, even here on earth, there is no curse any more. There is pain, there are tears, so that the strong language of the earlier part of the vision (xxi. 4) could not be so applied; but this certainly can. And surely it is as true now as it will be then that His servants serve Him, not yet indeed with perfect service, but with such as they have grace to render; and by faith they see His face; and by some subtle chemistry of grace His name does get written on their foreheads. Let us not lose this beautiful passage in its application to the present life. Let us have it as our constant ideal.

But for the great reality we must look forward to the future, when there shall be nothing *banned*, for that is the full force of the Greek (see R.V. margin), nothing forbidden, nothing profane, nothing that may not live in the full light of the Throne of God and of the Lamb; and when in the fullest sense His servants shall do Him service and see His face, and His name be on their foreheads.

Let us pause here for a moment to observe how satisfying to the thoughtful mind is this view of the heavenly life and work. There are many who imagine that, however reticent and reserved may be the suggestions as to the future life in other parts of Scripture, notably in the utterances of our Lord, the Book of Revelation can lay no claim to any such merit. Its heaven seems to be a perpetual singing and shouting and playing of golden harps. Those who make this objection only show with how little care they have read this great book. The references to harps and hallelujahs have certainly been frequent, as we have seen; but why? Because the glimpses which have been given of the future have been always after some grand crisis in the conflict of the ages. The jubilations have been pœans of victory. But the suggestion has never been made, and there is no authority whatever for making it, that these are the

normal occupations of the inhabitants. Now that we have come "to where beyond these voices there is peace," and are allowed to look into the city of God, in what we may by comparison call the even tenor of its life, here is the quiet, dignified, and eminently rational and sober account we have of it: "The servants of God shall do Him service; and they shall see His face; and His name shall be on their foreheads." Full activity in high and useful work, beatific vision, perfection of character. How reticent, yet how suggestive! inspiring, yet restful! nothing to satisfy an idle curiosity, everything to minister to a radiant hope.

This high service of the city of God shall not suffer through weariness, or through blundering; for this we take to be the main suggestion in the assurance given in this connection that "night shall be no more." There was, it will be remembered, a reference to the absence of night before (xxi. 25), but in such a connection as to suggest the absence of all that makes it necessary to guard the city from the terrors of the night and from the pestilence that walketh in darkness. Here the connection is quite different, so that, though the symbol is the same, the thought is new. Again we must remind ourselves that this is no physiographic lesson. Just as the declaration that there shall be no more sea does not necessarily mean the abolition of the ocean, so neither does this necessarily mean the abolition of that natural darkness which is so splendid a revealer of the glory of the sky. It means the abolition of that which night stands for to the ardent servant, who, however eager, is obliged to cease his task when his powers are spent, and, what is far more trying and baffling, to carry it on when he knows not what is to come out of it, or how his work would stand the revealing of the light of God. There all our work will be done in the light of God, so there will be no blundering, no need of unravelling tangled skeins, no need of painful doing to be followed by

still more painful undoing; no need of checks and counter-checks to prove that we have not gone astray; no need of any light but that which is always with us in the presence of God, of whom it is written, "The darkness and the light are both alike to Thee," "They need no light of lamp neither light of sun; for the Lord God giveth light."

"And they shall reign for ever and ever" gives the assurance of perfect mastery, a mighty comfort surely to those of us who continually feel that work is set us which overtaxes, work beyond our power, work which we can only struggle to do as best we can, and when it is done, are constrained to confess that it needs so much apology. No more of that: "They shall reign"; they shall have the mastery. There is, first, perfect mastery of self, the regnant position reached by Dante, when in his ascent of the Mount of Purification he gained the victory over the last and most refractory lust, and was told by his spiritual instructor that he now needed no further guidance or restraint:

Look not for me to signal or to speak;
Free, upright, healthy, is thine own will now,
And not to do as it commands were weak;
So, crowned and mitred, o'er thyself reign thou.

But there is more than self-mastery, there is mastery over circumstance: no more failing or shortcoming, no more abandoned enterprises, no more of that harassing sense of limitation which makes the best men feel as if they could not accomplish one-hundredth part of the service they are called to render, no more "letting I dare not wait upon I would," the power never lacking when holy ardour leads the way. All this too is involved in the final words, "they shall reign for ever and ever."

The rest is epilogue and need not detain us long; especially as it returns, after the manner of John, to the general position and leading thoughts of the prologue.

The repetition of the assurance that the things he has

spoken of are shortly to come to pass may come upon us strangely after reading of an interval of a thousand years, and dwelling thereafter on a prospect which, though having in it elements which serve as an ideal for the present, cannot be realized until a very long time shall have elapsed ; but let us not forget that these are only specimens of the far-off glimpses of hope which are given to reinforce failing faith and patience, amid calamities present and impending. The cloud rack which constitutes the main body of the vision was then impending, and was very soon to gather to a head and burst upon the Christians then living in Ephesus and Smyrna and all the Churches in Asia, and in Europe too. The days were close at hand when all the comfort of this Apocalypse would be very sorely needed. Remember that the Coming of the prologue and of the epilogue too is the cloud advent, "Behold He cometh with clouds." We have had glimpses of a final Coming when the clouds shall have rolled away, but the Coming with clouds was very close at hand.

And that John was on the alert for it, is evident from his readiness to fall down and worship before the feet of the angel who showed him these things. He had made that mistake before ; he makes it here again. What other explanation can there be of this than that the apostle, who was looking for the Coming of the Lord, should once and again, in presence of the radiant form before him, say to himself, "He has come: He is here," and fall down to worship at His feet. Clearly he meant what he said, when he spoke of the time as at hand.

When the time should come, it would be too late to change sides. That is the import of the solemn warning of the next paragraph (*vv.* 10-15).

As at the beginning, so at the end, the Lord Himself speaks in person, acknowledging the vision as from Him, and claiming His place as the Mediator between God and man,

the root and offspring of David, and yet the bright and morning star. His feet are on the earth; His head is in the highest heaven. And how cheering to have at the end of all this night of tempest the clear shining of the star of morning! He is the evening star amid the cloud rack of the coming night; He will be the morning star which ushers in the cloudless day. The star of evening and the star of morning are the same, both in nature and in grace:

Sweet Hesper-Phosphor, double name
For what is one, the first, the last,
Thou, like my present and my past,
Thy place is changed, thou art the same.

Then follows the last, perhaps the most gracious, of all the invitations of the gospel: "And the Spirit and the Bride say, Come. And he that heareth, let him say, Come; and he that is athirst, let him come; he that will, let him take the water of life freely."

This is the last word of the prophetic scroll, for what follows is simply the seal, to ensure the preservation of its integrity (*vv.* 18, 19); and the last words of all are the three closing voices of the heavenly revelation, three voices like angels coming and going between earth and heaven now made one through the finished gospel of God: a voice from above of glorious promise, "Surely I come quickly"; a voice from beneath of eager expectation, "Amen, even so come, Lord Jesus"; and a final benediction from above, "The grace of the Lord Jesus be with the saints. Amen."

J. MONRO GIBSON.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Rev. Professor B. W. Bacon, D.D.	
A Criticism of the New Chronology of Paul	351, 412
Vernon Bartlet, M.A.	
Some Points in Pauline History and Chronology	263
Rev. Professor J. H. Bernard, D.D.	
The Evidential Value of Miracle	331
Rev. Armstrong Black.	
The Twenty-third Psalm	35
Rev. A. A. Burd.	
Moses, the Angelic Mediator	233
Rev. A. E. Burn, M.A.	
The Ambrosiaster and Isaac the Converted Jew	368
Rev. Arthur Carr, M.A.	
Love and Righteousness: a Study on the Influence of Christianity on Language	321
Rev. Professor T. K. Cheyne, D.D.	
Something Better than Husks	32
Geographical Gains from Textual Criticism	228
Rev. Professor A. B. Davidson, D.D.	
The Word "Atone" in Extra-ritual Literature	92
Rev. Professor Marcus Dods, D.D.	
Survey of Recent English Literature on the New Testa- ment	74
Late Professor Henry Drummond, F.R.S.E., F.G.S.	
Spiritual Diagnosis: an Argument for Placing the Study of the Soul on a Scientific Basis	304
Rev. Professor R. A. Falconer, D.D.	
The Future of the Kingdom	339
Rev. J. Monro Gibson, M.A., D.D.	
7. The Seven Vials	119
8. The Scarlet Woman and her Fate	220
9. The Marriage Supper of the Lamb	292
10. The Great White Throne	375
11. The City of God	455
12. The Paradise of God	464

	PAGE
Rev. Canon Girdlestone, M.A.	
To What Tribe did Samuel Belong ?	385
Rev. J. R. Illingworth, M.A.	
The "Mystical" and "Sacramental" Temperaments . .	81
Professor A. N. Jannaris, M.A.	
Misreadings and Misrenderings in the New Testament :—	
3. Errors of Interpretation	142
C. H. W. Johns, M.A.	
Did the Assyrians Coin Money ?	389
Rev. J. H. Kennedy, D.D.	
St. Paul's Correspondence with Corinth	182
Rev. H. J. C. Knight, M.A.	
On the Relation of the Discourses of our Lord recorded in	
St. John iii. and vi. to the Institution of the Two	
Sacraments	54
Rev. Professor John Laidlaw, D.D.	
Richard Rothe, of Heidelberg	439
Rev. J. Warburton Lewis, B.A.	
Note on the Date of the First Epistle of Peter . . .	319
Rev. Professor Walter Lock, D.D.	
The Sheep and the Goats	401
Rev. Professor Allan Menzies, D.D.	
The Lord's Supper : St. Mark or St. Paul ?	241
Rev. George Milligan, M.A.	
The Place of Writing and Destination of the Epistle to	
the Hebrews	154
Professor W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D.	
A Historical Commentary on the Epistle to the	
Galatians	16, 104, 195
Mr. Lewin and Professor Bacon on the Passover . . .	431
J. Y. Simpson, M.A.	
Father John in Relation to the Russian Church . . .	161
Rev. John Watson, D.D.	
5. The Vicarious Sacrifice of Jesus Christ	1
6. The Sovereignty of God	128
7. Good Works	210
8. Sanctification	280
Rev. Newport J. D. White, B.D.	
The Appearances of the Risen Lord to Individuals . .	66

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis xxxii. 20	94	Ezekiel xvi. 63	95
Exodus xii. 14	259	xxxix. 17-24	377
xxiv. 8	252	Daniel iv. 27	326
xxxii. 10	100	Matthew viii. 27.	334
Numbers xiv. 11.	100	x. 16	344
xxv.	101	x. 23	347
xxvi. 9	387	xi. 20	336
xxxv. 30	97	xi. 27	64
Deuteronomy x. 17	95	xii. 4	152
xvi. 19	95	xii. 39	337
xxi. 8	96	xiii. 11.	63
xxxii. 26	99	xxiv. 12	323
xxxiii. 2	236	xxiv. 26-27	347
Joshua xviii. 17.	230	xxiv. 42-51.	341
xxi. 20-25	385	xxv. 31-33	401
1 Samuel iii. 14	96	xxvii. 42	333
viii. 2.	385	Mark ii. 10	335
xii. 3	94	iv. 11	63
xiv. 24	98	iv. 34	63
xxv. 44	230	viii. 26	336
xxvi. 19	96	viii. 31	247
xxxi. 8	123	ix. 1	343
2 Samuel xiii. 15	322	ix. 12	152
2 Kings vi. 25	32	ix. 43	31
xviii. 27.	33	x. 45	248
1 Chronicles vi. 62	231	xii. 1-9	248
xii. 8	387	Mark xii. 26	152
Nehemiah iii. 37	93	xii. 41	152
x. 54	326	xiii. 10	348
xi. 32	231	xvi. 16	54
Job ix. 24	95	Luke v. 8	334
xxxiii. 24.	94	vi. 4	152
Psalms xxiii.	35	vii. 16	335
xxx. 5	102	viii. 36	152
xxxii. 1	93	x. 22	64
xxxiii. 5	102	xi. 42	323
lxv. 3	95	xii. 2-12	344
lxxviii. 38	95	xii. 16-48	341
lxxix. 9	95	xvii. 20	347
lxxxv. 2	93	xvii. 20-23	344
cxii. 9	326	xvii. 24-37	349
Proverbs xvi. 14	94	xxii. 15.	250
Ecclesiastes ix. 1	322	xxii. 17-20	243, 245
Isaiah i. 8	34	xxii. 29	348
i. 19.	34	xxiii. 8	336
ix. 6	303	xxiv. 6	147
x. 28	229	Jchn i. 33	59
xxxvi. 12	33	ii. 11.	334
xxxviii. 17	95	iii. 1-8	54
xl. 2.	100	iv. 48	337
xlvi. 9	99	v. 25-29	380
Jeremiah ii. 2	322	vi.	61
xv. 1	101	vi. 15	335
xviii. 23	93	vi. 26.	336
xlvi. 2	231	vii. 37	64

	PAGE		PAGE
John xii. 31	224	2 Corinthians xi. 20	149
xii. 37	333	xii. 1	429
xx. 29	337	xii. 2-4	268
Acts i. 7	121	xii. 7	118
ii. 22	336	xiii. 1	183
ii. 38	156	Galatians i. 2	159
v. 31	156	i. 9	185
vii. 38	236, 240	i. 17	354
ix. 23-25	354	ii. 1-10	265
xi. 13	153	iii. 1-6	27
xi. 25	429	iii. 19	234
xi. 29	198	iii. 20	233
xi. 30	264	iv. 20	278
xii. 17	153	iv. 21-31	23
xiii. 19	157	v. 1	27
xiii. 50	276	v. 2-12	27
xv. 1	268	v. 16-26	106
xv. 10	203	vi. 1-5	115
xv. 21	24	vi. 11-17	199
xv. 36	17	vi. 16-17	205
xv. 37	19	vi. 17	207
xvi. 1	17	Ephesians iv. 23-24	200
xvi. 4.	203, 266, 278	Colossians i. 12	156
xvi. 6.	17	iii. 5	108
xvi. 12	101	iv. 7	158
xvii. 2	356	iv. 10	319
xviii. 2	418	iv. 18	199
xviii. 15	202	1 Thessalonians iii. 12	324
xviii. 23	17	2 „ ii. 2.	273
xx. 6-13	359	lii. 17.	199
xx. 18	153	1 Timothy i. 13	275
xx. 32	156	2 „ ii. 5	240
xxiii. 6	205	Titus iii. 5	60
xxvi. 18	156	iii. 9	371
Romans i. 7	324	Hebrews ii. 2	237
i. 9	147	viii. 6	237
i. 17	63, 328	xiii. 18.	25
i. 29	114	1 Peter v. 12, 13.	319
iii. 25	103, 328	1 John i. 9.	329
v. 4	239	iii. 11	324
xvi. 25-37	200	v. 6.	60
1 Corinthians i. 2	159	Revelation iii. 3	152
vi. 9	108	vi. 8	121
ix. 11	196	viii. 7-11	121
xi.	55	xi. 1-13	120
xi. 23-25	243	xv. 1	200
xiii. 3	325	xv. 2-4	119
xv. 5-8	66	xvii.	220
xvi. 21.	199	xviii.	220
xvi. 21-24	205	xix.	292
2 Corinthians i. 1	158	xx.	375
ii. 1	184	xxi.	455
iii.	260	xxii.	464
x. 10	20		



UCSB LIBRARY
X-18426

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 456 970 3

